

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY.

277

M 6

V. I

565

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY:

INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES TO THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,

DEAN OF ST PAUL'S. ^R

IN NINE VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON.
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1883.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

PREFACE

TO

THE THIRD EDITION.

THE demand for a third edition of this somewhat voluminous work cannot but be highly gratifying to the author. The book has been likewise stereotyped in the United States: on the whole, a very creditable specimen of American typography.

In this edition I have corrected a few errors which I have detected, or which have been pointed out by friendly critics, and a few misprints, which had crept, mostly into the notes. A few more notes have been added, chiefly from books either not published or not known to me at the time when the former editions were issued. I would name more especially the recent excellent work of Gregorovius, 'Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter.' One has been furnished to me by the kindness of my friend Dr. Stanley, who, in his enviable passion for visiting the scenes of great historical events, has, I may almost say, discovered the site of the Countess Matilda's castle, Canossa, where the memorable interview of Pope Hildebrand and the Emperor Henry IV. took place.

PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST EDITION.

THE History of Latin Christianity is a continuation of 'The History of Christianity to the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire.' But Latin Christianity appears to possess such a remarkable historic unity, that I have thought fit, in order to make this work complete in itself, to trace again its origin and earlier development, and to enter in some respects with greater fulness, yet without unnecessary repetition, into its history during the first four centuries. On one extremely dark part of that history a book but recently discovered has thrown unexpected light.

The sentence of Polybius which describes the unity, and the plan, of his History of Republican Rome, might be adopted by the historian of the Rise and Progress of Christian Rome. "Ουτος γὰρ ἐνὸς ἔργου καὶ θεάματος ἐνὸς τοῦ σύμπαιτος, ὑπὲρ τούτου γράφειν ἐπικεχειρήσαμεν" τοῦ, πῶς καὶ πότε, καὶ διὰ τί πάντα τὰ γνωριζόμενα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων δυναστείαν ἐγένετο.—l. iii. c. i. "The work which we have undertaken being one, the whole forming one great design, how, when, and by what means all the known world became subject to the Roman rule." Though the great sphere of Latin Christianity was Western Europe,

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

yet, during the first seven or eight centuries, it is so mingled up with the religious history of the Greek empire; the invasion of Western Europe by the Mohammedans, and the Crusades, so involved it again in the affairs of the East; that, in its influence at least, it extended to the limits of the known world.

My aim has been to write a history, not a succession of dissertations on history; to give with as much life and reality as I have been able, the result, not the process, of inquiry. This, where almost every event, every character, every opinion has been the subject of long, intricate, too often hostile controversy, was a task of no slight difficulty. Where the conflicting authorities have seemed to be nearly balanced, I have sometimes, but rarely, admitted them into the text, not desiring to speak with certainty, where certainty appeared unattainable: in general I have reserved such discussions, where inevitable, for the notes. Even in the notes I have endeavoured to avoid two things—a polemic tone and prolixity. I.—I have cited the names of modern writers, in general, only when their observations have been remarkable in themselves, as original, or as characteristic of the progress of opinion. II.—I have usually contented myself with quoting the authority which after due consideration I have thought it right to follow, instead of occupying a large space with concurrent or conflicting statements. Nothing can be more easy, now that we possess such admirable manuals of ecclesiastical history (especially the invaluable one of Gieseler), than to heap together to immeasurable extent citations from ancient authors or the opinions of learned men. I notice this solely that I may not be suspected

either of the presumption of having neglected the labours, or of want of gratitude for the aid, of that array of writers who—from the Magdeburg Centuriators, Baronius and his Continuator, through the great French scholars, Tillemont, Fleury, Dupin; the Germans, Mosheim, Schroeck, Neander, and countless others (where, alas! are the English historians of those times?)—have wrought with such indefatigable industry on the annals of Christianity. I have studied compression and condensation, rather than fulness and copiousness, simply in order to bring the work within reasonable compass.

PREFACE TO VOLUME IV.

FIRST EDITION.

I CANNOT offer the concluding volumes of the History of Latin Christianity without expressing my grateful sense of the kind and liberal manner in which the former portion of the work has been generally received. In these volumes I trust that I have not fallen below my constant aim—calm and rigid impartiality; the fearless exposure of the bad, full appreciation of the good, both in the institutions and in the men who have passed before my view. I hope that I may aver without presumption that my sole object is truth—truth uttered in charity; and where truth has appeared to me unattainable from want of sufficient authorities, or from authorities balanced or contradictory, I have

avoided the expression of any positive opinion. I am unwilling to claim the authority of history for that for which there is not historical evidence. I would further remind the reader that if the course of affairs during these ages should appear dark, at times almost to repulsiveness, still in the dreariest and most gloomy period of Christian history there was always an under-current of humble, Christian goodness flowing on, as the Saviour himself came, "without observation," the light of which we can discern but by faint and transitory glimpses. 438

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

INTRODUCTION.

AD	DESIGN AND PLAN OF THE WORK	PAGE
	DESIGN AND PLAN OF THE WORK	1
	CHRONOLOGY OF FIRST FOUR CENTURIES	13

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

BEGINNING OF ROMAN CHRISTIANITY.

	Roman Pontificate	20
	Epochs in Latin Christianity	21-25
	Growth of Christianity in Rome	25
	Obscurity of Bishop of Rome	29
67	Persecution of Nero	30
95	of Domitian	31
114	of Trajan—Ignatius of Antioch	ib.
	Church of Rome Greek	32
	African origin of Latin Christianity	35
	Church of Rome centre of Christianity	36
	of Christian controversy	38
	Judaising Christianity—The Clementina	39
196	Pope Victor—Quarto-deciman controversy	43
180-193	Reign of Commodus—Marcia	44
	Montanism	46
	Monarchianism	49
	Hippolytus Bishop of Porto	53
201-219	Pope Zephyrinus	ib.
	Pope Callistus	54
235-247	Persecution of Maximin—Decian persecution	59
	Cyprian of Carthage	60

A.D.		PAGE
254	Novatus—Novatian—Cornelius of Rome—The Lapsi	60
	Cyprian's unity of the Church	65
	Dispute between Rome and Carthage	66
258	Death of Cyprian—of Pope Xystus	69
259-304	Dionysius—Marcellinus—Marcellus	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER II.

ROME AFTER THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE.

312	Conversion of Constantine—Pope Silvester ..	71
	Donation—Edict of Milan	72
324-334	Foundation of Constantinople—Division of the empire	74
	Latin Christianity in Rome, and the West.. ..	75
325	Trinitarian controversy—1st period—Council of Nicaea	76
347	2nd period—Council of Sardica	77
352	Pope Liberius—Council of Arles—of Milan ..	80
357	Felix Anti-pope—Constantius in Rome	82
367	Damasus and Ursicinus	89
	Monasticism in Rome—Saint Jerome	90
384-398	Pope Siricius—First Decretal	96
	Celibacy of the clergy	98

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

INNOCENT I.

	Rome centre of the West	104
	Succession of St. Peter	106
	Unity of the Church	107
402	Innocent I.	111
404	Innocent and Chrysostom	116
405	Siege of Rome by Alaric—by Rhadagaisus— Stilicho	120
410	Capture by Alaric—Innocent absent	130
	Restoration of Rome	138
	Greatness of the bishop	139

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

xi

CHAPTER II

PELAGIANISM.

	PAGE
Pelagianism—Pelagius in the East	141
Origin of controversy	143
Augustinianism	147
Sacerdotal system	148
Transmission of original sin	150
417 Death of Pope Innocent I.	155
Zosimus	156
418 Council of Carthage—Zosimus retracts	158
Julianus of Eclana	161
Semi-Pelagianism—Cassianus	165

CHAPTER III

NESTORIANISM

Nestorianism	171
418 Death of Zosimus—Disputed election	174
419 Edict of Honorius—Boniface Pope—Celestin I.	174
428 Nestorius at Constantinople	181
Cyril of Alexandria	185
Persecution of Jews—Hypatia	187
Cyril against Nestorius	191
Both parties look to Rome—Pope Celestine	195
430 Council of Rome	197
430 Nestorius excommunicated	199
431 Council of Ephesus—General Councils	201
Memnon of Ephesus—Juvenal of Jerusalem	206
Decree of Council	211
Arrival of Syrian Bishops	212
Violent contest—Constantinople	214
Council of Chalcedon	217
Pulcheria	218
Nestorius abandoned	219
Treaty of Peace	222
Nestorianism proscribed	222

CHAPTER IV.

LEO THE GREAT.

A.D.		PAGE
440	Leo the Great	228
	Character of Leo—Sermons	229
	The Manicheans at Rome	234
	Affairs of Africa	236
	Affairs of Gaul—Hilarius of Arles	244
	Affairs of Spain—Priscillianism	250
	Illyricum—The East	253
	Eutyches—Eutychianism	255
449	Robber Synod of Ephesus—Death of Flavianus	260
451	Council of Chalcedon—Condemnation of Dioscorus	265
	Coequality of Constantinople and Rome	271
452	Attila—Embassy of Leo to Attila	275
455	Invasion of Genseric—Capture and pillage of Rome	278
457-461	The Emperor Majorian	282
	Three founders of Latin Christianity—Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine	283

BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

MONOPHYSITISM.

	Monophysitism	286
468	Pope Simplicius—Close of the Western Empire	288
	Church in the East	289
	Simeon Stylites	292
457-474	Revolutions in Constantinople—Death of Marcian	293
	Zeno expelled by Basiliscus	294
482	Henoticon of Zeno	296
	Question of Roman supremacy	298
483	Death of Pope Simplicius—Decree of Odoacer ..	301
	Felix III. Pope—Excommunicates Acacius of Constantinople	302
484	Acacius excommunicates Pope Felix	304
	Schism of forty years	ib.
	Four parties in the East	306
495	Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople	307

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

XIII

A.D.		PAGE
505-6	Tumults in Constantinople—The Emperor Anastasius	311
510	Deposition of Macedonius	312
513	Constantinople in insurrection	313
514	Revolt of Vitalianus	315
	Humiliation of Anastasius	316
	Influence of the Monks	317
492	Pope Gelasius I.	320
496	Pope Anastasius II.	322
498	Pope Symmachus	323

CHAPTER II.

CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACES.

	Conversion of the Teutonic races	325
	Conversion of Germans within the Empire	327
	Teutonic character	328
	Teutonic religion—Woden	329
	Human sacrifices—Animal sacrifices	332
	Holy groves	333
	Priesthood	334
	Teutons encounter Christianity	336
	Christ a God of battle	337
	No Teutonic priesthood in their migrations	338
	Effect of invasion on Christians	339
	Teutons in the Roman empire	341
	Successive conversion of the tribes	343
	Arianism of first converts	<i>ib.</i>
	Ulphilas	344
	History of conversion unknown, except of Burgundians	347
	Conversion of Franks	349
496	Clovis the only orthodox sovereign	353
	Religious wars	355
	Influence of clergy—Clergy Latin	357
	Effects of conversion on Teutons	360
	on moral purity—German character in this respect	361
	Merovingian kings	366
	Christianity barbarises	368
	Increase of sacerdotal power—Bishops a separate order	370

CHAPTER III.

THEODORIC THE OSTROGOTH.

A.D.		PAGE
	Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy	374
	Odoacer	<i>ib.</i>
	Union of the races imperfect	376
	Division of lands	378
	Theodoric—Peace of Italy	379
	Theodoric's religious rule	383
499	Contested election for the popedom	386
	Theodoric in Rome	388
	Charges against Symmachus	389
	Tumults in Rome	389
	Synods	390
	Decree of the Palmary Synod	391
	Affairs of the East	393
514	Pope Hormisdas	394
	The Emperor Anastasius	<i>ib.</i>
	Papal embassy to Constantinople	395
518	Death of Anastasius the Emperor	399
518	Accession of Justin	400
	Close of the schism	401
	Prosperity of Theodoric	402
	Rumours of conspiracies	404
	State of Theodoric's family	406
	Charges against Albinus	408
525	Correspondence with the East—Mission of Pope	
	John	409
	Boethius—His death	414
	Death of Theodoric	416
	Ravenna	417

CHAPTER IV.

JUSTINIAN.

527	Justinian—Theodora	420
	Persian and African Wars	422
	Suppression of schools at Athens	423
	Conquest of Africa	425
	Ostrogothic kingdom—Death of Athalaric—of	
	Amalasuntha	426
	Witiges king	<i>ib.</i>

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

xv

A.D.		PAGE
526-535	Popes Felix IV., Boniface II., John II., Agapetus	427
	Agapetus in Constantinople	429
536	Conquest of Italy by Justinian	431
	Rome surrendered to Belisarius	<i>ib.</i>
	Vigilius	432
537	Silverius degraded	433
	Vigilius Pope	434
544	The three Chapters	435
	Vigilius summoned to Constantinople	436
548	Tergiversation of Vigilius	<i>ib.</i>
554	Banishment—Death	439
556	Pope Pelagius I.	441
	Totila	<i>ib.</i>
	The eunuch Narses	444
	Popes John III., Benedict I., Pelagius II. ..	<i>ib.</i>

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

INTRODUCTION.

Design and Plan of the Work.

THE great event in the history of our religion and of mankind, during many centuries after the extinction of Paganism, is the rise, the development, and the domination of Latin Christianity. Though the religion of Christ had its origin among a Syrian people—though its Divine Author spoke an Aramaic dialect—Christianity was almost from the first a Greek religion. Its primal records were all, or nearly all, written in the Greek language; it was promulgated with the greatest rapidity and success among nations either of Greek descent, or those which had been Grecised by the conquests of Alexander; its most flourishing churches were in Greek cities. Greek was the commercial language in which the Jews, through whom it was at first disseminated, and who were even now settled in almost every province of the Roman world, carried on their intercourse. Primitive Christianity no doubt continued to speak in Syriac to vast numbers of disciples in the Syrian provinces; it spread eastward to a considerable extent, in Babylonia

and beyond the Euphrates, into regions where Greek ceased to be the common tongue. Oriental influences, influences even from the remoter East, worked into its doctrine and into its system; yet even these flowed in chiefly or in great part through Greek channels. The Indian Monasticism^a had already been domiciliated in Palestine and among the Egyptian Jews. Oriental and Egyptian notions had found their way into the Greek philosophy. Among the earlier Christian converts were some of these partially orientalised Greek philosophers. Many of the first teachers had been trained in their schools. In Antioch, in Alexandria, even in Ephesus there was something of an Asiatic cast in the Greek civilisation.

Character of Greek Christianity. Greek Christianity could not but be affected both in its doctrinal progress and in its polity by its Greek origin. Among the Greeks had been for centuries agitated all those primary questions which lie at the bottom of all religions;—the formation of the worlds—the existence and nature of the Deity—the origin and cause of evil, though this seems to have been studied even with stronger predilection in the trans-Euphratic East. Hence Greek Christianity was insatiably inquisitive, speculative. Confident in the inexhaustible copiousness and fine precision of its language, it endured no limitation to its curious investigations. As each great question was settled or worn out, it was still ready to propose new ones. It began with

^a Compare, on Buddhist monasticism, the very curious visitation of the Buddhist monasteries at the close of the fourth century, the continuation of earlier visitations anterior

to the Christian era, the *Foe Koueki*, translated by M. A. Rémusat, Paris, 1836; also the recent more popular work by Mr. Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, London, 1850.

the Divinity of Christ (still earlier perhaps with some of the Gnostic Cosmogonical or Theophanic theories) so onward to the Trinity : it expired, or at least drew near its end as the religion of the Roman East, discussing the Divine Light on Mount Tabor.

In their polity the Grecian churches were a federation of republics, as were the settlements of the Jews. But they were founded on a religious, not on a national basis ; external to, yet in their boundaries, mostly in their aggregative system, following the old commonwealths, which still continued to subsist under the supremacy of the Roman Prefect or Proconsul, and in later times the distribution of the Imperial dioceses. They were held together by common sympathies, common creeds, common sacred books, certain, as yet simple, but common rites, common usages of life, and a hierarchy everywhere, in theory at least, of the same power and influence. They admitted the Christians or other places by some established sign, or by recommendatory letters. They were often bound together by mutual charitable subventions. Still each was an absolutely independent community. The Roman East, including Greece, had no capital. The old kingdoms might respect the traditionary greatness of some city, which had been the abode of their kings, or which was the seat of a central provincial government : other cities, from their wealth and population, may have assumed a superior rank, Antioch in Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Ephesus in Asia Minor. But though churches known or reputed to have been founded by Apostles might be looked on with peculiar respect, there was as yet no subordination, no supremacy ; their federal

union was a voluntary association. Whether the internal constitution had become more or less rapidly or completely monarchical; whether the Bishop had risen to a greater or less height above his co-Presbyters, the whole episcopal order, the representatives of each church, were on the same level. The Metropolitan and afterwards the Patriarchal dignity was of later growth. Jerusalem, which might naturally have aspired to the rank of the Christian capital, at least in the East, had been destroyed, and remained desolate for many years: it assumed only at a later period (at one time it was subject to Cæsarea) even the Patriarchal rank.

But at the extinction of Paganism, Greek, or, as it may now be called in opposition to the West, Eastern

Christianity, had almost ceased to be aggressive. Except the contested conversion of the Bulgarians, later of the Russians, and a few wild tribes, it achieved no conquests. The Nestorians alone, driven into exile by cruel persecutions, formed settlements, and propagated their own form of Christianity in Persia, India, perhaps in still more distant lands. The Eastern Church never recovered the ground which it had lost before the revived Magianism of the Sassanian kings of Persia; and it was compelled to retire within still narrowing bounds before triumphant Mohammedanism. The Greek hierarchy had now lost their unity of action. The great Patriarchates, which by this time had been formed on the authority of Councils, were involved in perpetual strife, or were contested by rival bishops, till three of them, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, sank into administrators of a tolerated religion under the Mohammedan

Not aggressive.

dominion. The Bishop of Constantinople was the passive victim, the humble slave, or the factious adversary of the Byzantine Emperor: rarely exercised a lofty moral control upon his despotism. The lower clergy, whatever their more secret beneficent or sanctifying workings on society, had sufficient power, wealth, rank, to tempt ambition, or to degrade to intrigue; not enough to command the public mind for any great salutary purpose; to repress the inveterate immorality of an effete age; to reconcile jarring interests; to mould together hostile races: in general they ruled, where they did rule, by the superstitious fears, rather than by the reverence and attachment of a grateful people. They sank downward into the common ignorance, and yielded to that worst barbarism—a worn-out civilisation. Greek Monasticism. Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion and religious indolence; but except where the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions, they had little effect on the condition of society. They stood aloof from the world, the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks, in their jealously-barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition.

Greek theology still maintained its speculative tendency; it went on defining with still more exquisite subtlety the Godhead and the nature of Greek Theology. Christ. The interminable controversy still lengthened out, and cast forth sect after sect from the enfeebled community. The great Greek writers, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, had passed away and left only

unworthy successors; the splendid public eloquence had expired on the lips of Chrysostom. There was no writer who laid strong hold on the imagination or reason of men, except the author of that extraordinary book, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, of which perhaps the remote influence was greater in the West than in the Byzantine empire. John of Damascus, the powerful adversary of Iconoclasm, is a splendid exception, not merely on account of the polemic vigour shown in that controversy, but as a theologian doubtless the ablest of his late age. The Greek language gradually, but slowly, degenerated; at length, but not entirely till after the fall of Constantinople, it broke up into barbarous dialects; but it gave birth by fusion with foreign tongues to no new language productive of noble poetry, of oratory, or philosophy. A rude and premature reformation, that of Iconoclasm, attempted to overthrow the established traditionary faith, but offered nothing to supply its place which could either enlighten the mind or enthrall the religious affections: it destroyed the images, but it did not reveal the Original Deity, or the Christ in his pure and essential spirituality. Greek Christianity remained however, and still remains, a separate and peculiar form of faith: it repudiated all the attempts of the feebler sovereigns of the East to barter its independence for succour against the formidable Turks: it is still the religion of revived Greece, and of the vast Russian empire.

Latin Christianity, on the other hand, seemed
 Latin Chris- endowed with an inexhaustible principle of
 tianity. expanding life. No sooner had the Northern
 tribes entered within its magic circle, than they sub-

mitted to its yoke: and, not content with thus conquering its conquerors, it was constantly pushing forward its own frontier, and advancing into the strongholds of Northern Paganism. Gradually it became a monarchy, with all the power of a concentrated dominion. The clergy assumed an absolute despotism over the mind of man: not satisfied with ruling princes and kings, themselves became princes and kings. Their organisation was coincident with the bounds of Christendom; they were a second universal magistracy, exercising always equal, asserting, and for a long period possessing, superior power to the civil government. They had their own jurisprudence—the canon law,—co-ordinate with and of equal authority with the Roman or the various national codes, only with penalties infinitely more terrific, almost arbitrarily administered, and admitting no exception, not even that of the greatest temporal sovereign. Western Monasticism, in its general character, was not the barren, idly laborious or dreamy quietude of the East. It was industrious and productive: it settled colonies, preserved arts and letters, built splendid edifices, fertilized deserts. If it rent from the world the most powerful minds, having trained them by its stern discipline, it sent them back to rule the world. It continually, as it were, renewed its youth, and kept up a constant infusion of vigorous life, now quickening into enthusiasm, now darkening into fanaticism; and by its perpetual rivalry, stimulating the zeal, or supplying the deficiencies of the secular clergy. In successive ages it adapted itself to the state of the human mind. At first a missionary to barbarous nations, it built abbeys, hewed down forests, cultivated

Latin Monasticism.

swamps, enclosed domains, retrieved or won for civilisation tracts which had fallen to waste, or had never known culture. With St. Dominic it turned its missionary zeal upon Christianity itself, and spread as a preaching order throughout Christendom; with St. Francis it became even more popular, and lowered itself to the very humblest of mankind. In Jesuitism it made a last effort to govern mankind by an incorporated caste. But Jesuitism found it necessary to reject many of the peculiarities of Monasticism: it made itself secular to overcome the world. But the compromise could not endure. Over the Indians of South America alone, but for the force of circumstances, it might have been lasting. In Eastern India it became a kind of Christian Paganism; in Europe a moral and religious Rationalism, fatal both to morals and to religion.

Throughout this period, then, of at least ten centuries, Latin Christianity was the religion of the Western nations of Europe: Latin the religious language; the Latin translation of the Scriptures the religious code of mankind. Latin theology was alone inexhaustibly prolific, and held wide and unshaken authority. On most speculative tenets this theology had left to Greek controversialists to argue out the endless transcendental questions of religion, and contented herself with resolutely embracing the results, which she fixed in her inflexible theory of doctrine. The only controversy which violently disturbed the Western Church was the practical one, on which the East looked almost with indifference, the origin and motive principle of human action—grace and free will. This, from Augustine to Luther and Jansenius, was the

Latin Christianity.

interminable, still reviving problem. Latin Christian literature, like Greek, might have seemed already to have passed its meridian after Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and, high above all, Augustine. The age of true Latin poetry, no doubt, had long been over; the imaginative in Christianity could only find its expression to some extent in the legend and in the ritual; but, except in a very few hymns, it was not till out of the wedlock of Latin with the Northern tongues, not till after new languages had been born in the freshness of youth, that there were great Christian poets: poets not merely writing on religious subjects, but instinct with the religious life of Christianity,—Dante, Arioste, Tasso, Shakspeare, Milton, Calderon, Schiller. But not merely did Latin theology expand into another vast and teeming period, that of the schoolmen, culminating in Aquinas; but Latin being the common language, the clergy, the only learned body throughout Europe, it was that of law in both its branches; of science, of philosophy, even of history; of letters; in short, of civilisation. Latin Christianity, when her time was come, had her great æra of art, not only as the preserver of the traditions of Greek and Roman skill in architecture, and some of the technical operations in sculpture and painting, but original and creative. It was art comprehending architecture, painting, sculpture, and music, Christian in its fullest sense, as devoted entirely to Christian uses, expressive of Christian sentiments, arising out of and kindling in congenial spirits Christian thought and feeling.

The characteristic of Latin Christianity was that of the old Latin world — a firm and even obstinate adhe-

rence to legal form, whether of traditional usage or written statute; the strong assertion of, and the ^{its character.} severe subordination to, authority. Its wildest and most eccentric fanaticism, for the most part, and for many centuries, respected external unity. It was the Roman empire, again extended over Europe by an universal code and a provincial government; by a hierarchy of religious prætors or proconsuls, and a host of inferior officers, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, and gradually descending to the very lowest ranks of society: the whole with a certain degree of freedom of action, but a restrained and limited freedom, and with an appeal to the spiritual Cæsar in the last resort.

Latin Christianity maintained its unshaken dominion until, what I venture to call, Teutonic Christianity,^b aided by the invention of paper and of printing, asserted its independence, threw off the great mass of traditional religion, and out of the Bible summoned forth a more simple faith, which seized at once on the reason, on the conscience, and on the passions of men. This faith, with a less perfectly organised outward system, has exercised a more profound moral control, through the sense of strictly personal responsibility. Christianity^c became a vast

^b Throughout the world, wherever the Teutonic is the groundwork of the language, the Reformation either is, or, as in Southern Germany, has been dominant; wherever Latin, Latin Christianity has retained its ascendancy.

^c It is obvious that I use Christi-

anity, and indeed Teutonic Christianity, in its most comprehensive significance, from national episcopal churches, like that of England, which aspires to maintain the doctrines and organisation of the apostolic, or immediately post-apostolic ages, onward to that dubious and undefinable verge

influence working irregularly on individual minds, rather than a great social system, coerced by a central supremacy, by an all-embracing spiritual control, and held together by rigid usage, or by outward signs of common citizenship. Its multiplicity and variety, rather than its unity, was the manifestation of its life; or rather its unity lay deeper in its being, and consisted more in intellectual sympathies, in affinities of thought and feeling, of principles and motives, in a more remote or rather untraceable kindred through the common Father and common Saviour. Ceremonial uniformity seemed to retire into subordinate importance and estimation. Books gradually became, as far as the instruction of the human race, a co-ordinate priesthood. No longer rare, costly, inaccessible, or unintelligible, they descended to classes which they had never before approached. Eloquence or argument, instead of expiring on the ears of an entranced but limited auditory, addressed mankind at large, flew through kingdoms, crossed seas, perpetuated and promulgated themselves to an incalculable extent. Individual men could not but be working out in their own studies, in their own chambers, in their own minds, the great problems of faith. The primal records of Christianity, in a narrow

where Christianity melts into a high moral theism, a faith which would expand to purer spirituality with less distinct dogmatic system; or that which would hardly call itself more than a Christian philosophy, a religious Rationalism. I presume not, neither is it the office of the historian, to limit the blessings of our religion either in

this world or the world to come; "there is One who will know his own." As an historian I can disfranchise none who claim, even on the slightest grounds, the privileges and hopes of Christianity: repudiate none who do not place themselves without the pale of believers and worshippers of Christ, or of God through Christ.

compass, passed into all the vernacular languages of the world, where they could not be followed by the vast, scattered, and ambiguous volumes of tradition. The clergy became less and less a separate body (the awakened conscience of men refused to be content with vicarious religion through them); they ceased to be the sole arbiters of man's destiny in another life: they sank back into society, to be distinguished only as the models and promoters of moral and religious virtue, and so of order, happiness, peace, and the hope of immortality. They derived their influence less from a traditional divine commission or vested authority, than from their individual virtue, knowledge, and earnest, if less authoritative, inculcation of divine truth. Monasticism was rejected as alien to the primal religion of the Gospel; the family life, the life of the Christian family, resumed its place as the highest state of Christian grace and perfection.

This progressive development of Christianity seems the inevitable consequence of man's progress in knowledge, and in the more general dissemination of that knowledge. Human thought is almost compelled to assert, and cannot help asserting, its original freedom. And as that progress is manifestly a law of human nature, proceeding from the divine Author of our being, this self-adaptation of the one true religion to that progress must have the divine sanction, and may be supposed, without presumption, to have been contemplated in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom.

The full and more explicit expansion of these views on this Avatar of Teutonic Christianity must await its proper place at the close of our history.

Progressive
development
of Christian-
ity.

BOOK I.

CHRONOLOGY OF FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
42	1 St. Peter (according to Jerome).	Claudius, year 2	
43	2	Claudius in Britain.
44	3	Death of Herod.
45	4	Agrippa the Younger in favour with Claudius.
46	5	St Paul visits Jerusalem with Barnabas.
47	6	Tiberius Alexander, Governor in Judea.
48	7	Agrippa the Younger succeeds his uncle, Herod.
49	8	Cumanus, Governor of Judea.
50	9	Council of Jerusalem. 1 Epistle to Thessalonians.
51	10	The date of the expulsion of the Jews (Suet. Claud.) uncertain, but as Agrippa in Rome was in high favour, and would protect the Jewish interests, it was probably after his departure from Rome.
52	11	Felix, Governor of Judea. 2 Epistle to Thessalonians.
53	12	
54	13	Nero, Oct. 13	
55	14	Paul at Ephesus. 1 Epistle to Cor.
56	15	At Corinth. Epistle to Galatians.
57	16	At Corinth. Epistle to Romans.
58	17	Death of Agrippa.
59	18	Paul before Felix. Before Festus. In Malta.
60	19	Paul in Rome, writes to the Ephesians.
61	20	
62	21	
63	22	Paul acquitted. Epistles to Philip- pians, Colossians, Philemon.
64	23	Fire of Rome. Persecution of the Christians. Florus, Governor of Judea.
65	24	
66	25	Nero goes to Greece.
67	1 Linus (according to Jerome, Irenæus, Eusebius).	Martyrdom of St. Paul—and of St. Peter (?).
68	2 Clement (according to Tertullian and Rufinus).	Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian.	Death of Nero, in June.
69	3	
70	4	Capture and destruction of Jerusalem.
71	5	
72	6	
73	7	

EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Book I.

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
74	8		
75	9		
76	10		
77	11		
78	1 Cletus, or Anacletus (?).		
79	2	Titus.	
80	3		
81	4	Domitian ..	Death of Titus, Sept. 12.
82	5		
83	6		
84	7		
85	8		
86	9		
87	10		
88	11		
89	12		
90	13		
91	1 Clement (? (according to later writers).		
92	2		
93	3		
94	4		
95	5	Death of the Consul Flavius Clemens on account of Jewish superstition.
96	6	Nerva.	
97	7		
98	8	Trajan.	
99	9	Death of St. John (Irenæus, <i>Enschlus</i>).
100	1 Evaristus (?).		
101	2		
102	3		
103	4	Pliny in Bithynia.
104	5	Pliny's Letter to Trajan.]
105	6		
106	7		
107	8		
108	9		
109	1 Alexander (?).		
110	2		
111	3		
112	4		
113	5		
114	6	Trajan in the East Sedition of the Jews in Egypt and Cyrene.
115	7		Martyrdom of Ignatius.
116	8		
117	9	Hadrian.	
118	10		
119	1 Sixtus (?).		
120	2		
121	3		
122	4		
123	5	Hadrian at Athens. Apologies of Quadratus and Aristides.
124	6		
125	7		
126	8		
127	9		
128	10		
129	1 Telesphorus.		
130	2		
131	3	Hadrian in Egypt.
132	4	Jewish war.
133	5		

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
134	6	Bar Cochba persecutes the Christians.
135	7	End of the Jewish war.
136	8	Foundation or reconstruction of Ælia
137	9	on the ruins of Jerusalem.
138	10	Antoninus Pius.	
139	1 Hyginus.		
140	2		
141	3		
142	4		
143	1 Pius I.		
144	2		
145	3		
146	4		
147	5		
148	6		
149	7		
150	8	Polycarp in Rome.
151	9	Marcion in Rome. Justin Martyr
152	10		Apology I.
153	11		
154	12		
155	13		
156	14		
157	1 Anicetus.		
158	2		
159	3		
160	4		
161	5	M. Aurelius	
162	6	(Verus)	
163	7		
164	8		
165	9		
166	10	Parthian War ended. Marcus Aure-
			lius in the East. Martyrdom of
			Polycarp (?).
167	11	Terror about Marcomannian War.
			Justin Martyr
			Apology of Athenagoras.
168	1 Soter	Death of Verus.
169	2	
170	3		
171	4	Letter of Dionysius.
172	5	Apology of Melito, B. of Ccrrinth,
173	6	Euseb. H.E. iv, 23.
174	7	Battle with Quadi—Storm thought
175	8	miraculous.
176	9		
177	1 Eleutherius (or 176)	Martyrs of Lyons.
178	2		
179	3		
180	4	Commodus.	
181	5		
182	6		
183	7		
184	8		
185	9		
186	10		
187	11		
188	12		
189	13		
190	1 Victor (?) ..	Pertinax.	
191	2	Julianus.	
192	3	Niger.	

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
193	4	Severus.	
194	5	Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla.
195	6		
196	7	Dispute about Easter.—Euseb. H. E. v. 24.
197	8		
198	9		
199	10		
200	11		
201	12		
202	1 Zephyrinus (?)	Persecution of Severus in Egypt.
203	2	Origen teaches in Egypt.
204	3		
205	4		
206	5		
207	6	Tertullian, Lib. I. Adv. Marcion. He is now a Montanist.
208	7		
209	8		
210	9		
211	10	Caracalia, Geta.	
212	11	Origen at Rome. Tertullian ad Scapulam (?).
213	12		
214	13		
215	14		
216	15		
217	16	Macrinus.	
218	17	Elagabalus ..	Hippolytus bishop of Porto.
219	1 Callistus.		
220	2		
221	3		
222	4	Alexander Severus.	
223	1 Urbanus.		
224	2		
225	3		
226	4		
227	5		
228	6		
229	7		
230	1 Pontianus, July 22.		
231	2		
232	3		
233	4		
234	5		
235	6 Anteros (Pontianus died Sept. 28). Anteros died June 18, 236.	Maximus The 2 Gordians Pupienus Balbinus.	Pontianus banished to Sardinia His Martyrdom (?) Martyrdom of Hippolytus (?)
236	1 Fabianus.		
237	2		
238	3	Gordianus Junior.	
239	4		
240	5		
241	6		
242	7		
243	8		
244	9	Philippus Arabs.	
245	10		
246	11		
247	12		
248	13	Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.
249	14	Decius	Martyrdom of Fabianus, Jan. 20
250	See vacant.		

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
251	1 Cornelius June 4, d. Sept. 14.	Gallus	St. Cyprian.
252	1 Lucius.		
253	1 Stephen	Death of Origen.
254	2	Emilianus - Vale- rianus.	Controversy concerning the Lapsi. Novatian Antipope.
255	3	Controversy about baptism of Here- tics. III. Council of Carthage.
256	4	Exile of Cyprian.
257	Sixtus II., Martyr, d. Aug. 2, 258. Vacancy.	Martyrdom of Sixtus. Martyrdom of Cyprian, Sept. 14.
258	1 Dionysius, July 22.	
259	2	Gallienus.	
260	3		
261	4		
262	5		
263	6		
264	7		
265	8		
266	9		
267	10	Claudius.	
268	1 Felix.		
269	2	Aurelian	Paul of Samosata deposed.
270	3	
271	4	Manes from A.D. 241 to A.D. 272.
272	5		
273	6		
274	1 Eutychianus ..	Tacitus, Probus. Florianus.	
275	2		
276	3		
277	4		
278	5		
279	6		
280	7		
281	8	Carus, Carinus. Numerianus.	
282	1 Caus	Diocletian.	
283	2		
284	3		
285	4	Maximian.	
286	5		
287	6		
288	7		
289	8	Lactantius.
290	9		
291	10	Two Cæsars, Constantius, Galerius.	
292	11		
293	12		
294	13		
295	1 Marcellinus, June 30	Arnobius.
296	2		
297	3		
298	4		
299	5		
300	6	Persecution.
301	7		
302	8		
303	Died Oct. 24.	Constantius, Ga- lerius.	Abdication of Diocletian and Maximian.
304	See vacant.		
305	Severus-Maximin.	
306		

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
307	Constantine, Maxentius, Licinius, Maximian.	
308	Marcellus, May 19.	Six Emperors.	Death of Severus.
309	Eusebius, 6 months	Death of Maximian.
310	1 Vacancy. Mel-	Death of Galerius.
311	chiades, July 2.	
312	Victory of Constantine over Maxen-
313	tius.
314	1 Sylvester, Jan. 31	Edict of Milan, Oct. 28.
315	2		
316	3		
317	4		
318	5		
319	6		
320	7		
321	8		
322	9		
323	10	Defeat and death of Licinius.
324	11	Constantine sole Emperor.
325	12	Council of Nicea, June 19.
326	13		
327	14		
328	15		
329	16		
330	17		
331	18		
332	19		
333	20		
334	21		
335	22		
336	1 Marcus, Jan. 18.	Exile of Athanasius
337	1 Julius I., Feb. 6.	Constantine, Constans, Constantius.	Baptism of Constantine.
338	2	Athanasius returns from exile.
339	3	
340	4	Constantine defeated and killed by Constans. Death of Eusebius of Cæsarea.
341	5	Athanasius in Rome. Law against Pagan sacrifices.
342	6	
343	7	
344	8	Athanasius at Milan, in Gaul.
345	9		
346	10		
347	11	Council of Sardica.
348	12	Council of Philippopolis.
349	13	Athanasius in Alexandria.
350	14	Magnentius	Constans killed in Spain by Magnen-
351	15		tius.
352	1 Julius died April 5; Liberius, May 22.		
353	2	Constantine alone	Battle of Mursa. Death of Magnen-
354	3	tius.
355	4	Birth of Augustine. Council of Arles. Council of Milan. Banishment of Liberius
356	5 (Valix, Anti-Pope)	Jahan's Campaign in Gaul. Atha-
			nasius exiled from Alexandria.

A.D.	Bishops of Rome.	Emperors.	Remarkable Events, &c.
357	6	Constantius at Rome.
358	7	Recall of Liberius.
359	8	Council of Rimini. Council of Seleucia.
360	9	Death of Constantius.
361	10	Julian	Athanasius returns to Alexandria — again expelled.
362	11	Attempt to rebuild the Temple.
363	12	Jovian	Death of Julian, June 26.
364	13	Valentinian, Valens.	
365	14		
366	15 died Sept. 29.		
367	1 Damasus	Gratian	Tumults at Rome on the contested election of Damasus and Ursicinus.
368	2		
369	3		
370	4		
371	5		
372	6		
373	7	Death of Athanasius, May 2
374	8		
375	9	Valentinian II	Ambrose, Bishop of Milan.
376	10		
377	11		
378	12	Death of Valens.
379	13	Theodosius, Emp. of the East.	Theodosius expels the Arians. Synod against Priscillian.
380	14	Council of Constantinople. Address of Symmachus on Statute of Theodosius de Hereticis.
381	15		
382	16		
383	17		
384	18 Damasus died Dec. 11	Jerome retires to Bethlehem.
385	1 Siricius.		
386	2		
387	3	Chrysostom ad Antiochenos.
388	4		
389	5		
390	6	Temple of Serapis destroyed.
391	7		
392	8		
393	9	Jerome retires to Bethlehem.
394	10		
395	11	Honorius, Arcadius.	
396	12		
397	13		
398	14 died Nov. 26	Death of Ambrose
399	Anastasius	Chrysostom Bishop of Constantinople.
400			

BOOK I.



CHAPTER I.

Beginning of Roman Christianity.

LATIN Christianity, from its commencement, in its character, and in all the circumstances of its development, had an irresistible tendency to monarchy. Its capital had for ages been the capital of the world, and it still remained that of Western Europe. This monarchy reached its height under Hildebrand and Innocent III.; the history of the Roman Pontificate thus becomes the centre of Latin Christian History. The controversies of the East, in which Occidental or Roman Christianity mingled with a lofty dictation, sometimes so unimpassioned, that it might seem as though the establishment of its own supremacy was its ultimate aim—the conversion of the different races of Barbarians, who constituted the world of Latin Christendom—Monasticism, with the forms which it assumed in its successive Orders—the rise and conquests of Mohammedanism, with which Latin religion came at length into direct conflict, at first in Spain and Gaul, in Sicily and Italy; afterwards when the Popes placed themselves at the head of the Crusades, and Islam and Latin Christianity might seem to contest the dominion of the human race—the restoration of the Western empire beyond the Alps—the feudal system of which

Roman pontificate the centre of Latin Christianity.

the Pope aspired to be as it were the spiritual Suzerain—the long and obstinate conflicts with the temporal power—the origin and tenets of the sects which attempted to withdraw from the unity of the church, and to retire into independent communities—the first struggles of the human mind for freedom within Latin Christendom—the gradual growth of Christian literature, Christian art, and Christian philosophy—all these momentous subjects range themselves as episodes in the chronicle of the Roman bishops. Hence our history obtains that unity which impresses itself upon the attention, and presents the vicissitudes of centuries as a vast, continuous, harmonious whole; while at the same time it breaks up and separates itself into distinct periods, each with its marked events, peculiar character, and commanding men. And so the plan of our work may, at least, attempt to fulfil the two great functions of history, to arrest the mind and carry it on with unflagging interest, to infix its whole course of events on the imagination and the memory, as well by its broad and definite landmarks, as by the life and reality of its details in each separate period. The writer is unfeignedly conscious how far his own powers fall below the dignity of his subject, below the accomplishment of his own conceptions.

I.—The first of these periods in the history of Latin Christianity closes with Pope Damasus and his two successors.^d Its age of total obscurity is A.D. 386-401. passed, its indistinct twilight is brightening into open day. The Christian bishop is become so important a personage in Rome, as to be the subject of profane his-

^d There is another advantage in this | is that of Pop: Siricius, the successor
division; the first authentic decretal | of Damasus.

tory. His election is a cause of civil strife. Christianity more than equally divides the Patriciate, still more the people; it has already ascended the Imperial throne. Noble matrons and virgins are becoming the vestals of Christian Monasticism. The bitterness of the Heathen party betrays a galling sense of inferiority. Paganism is writhing, struggling, languishing in its death pangs, Christianity growing haughty and wanton in its triumph.

II.—The second ends with Pope Leo the Great.

A.D. 461. Paganism has made its last vain effort, not now for equality, for toleration. It has been

buried under the ruins of the conquered capital. Alaric tramples out its last embers. Rome emerges from its destruction by the Goths a Christian city. The East has wrought out, after the strife of two centuries, the dogmatic system of the church, which Rome receives with haughty condescension, as if she had imposed it on the world. The great Western controversy, Pelagianism, has been agitated and has passed away. Pretensions to the successorship of St. Peter are

A.D. 402-417. already heard from Innocent I. Claims are made at least to the authority of a Western Patriarch.

A.D. 440-461. In Leo the Great, half a century later, the Pope is not merely the greatest personage in Rome, but even in Italy; he takes the lead as a pacific protector against the Barbarians. Leo the Great is likewise the first distinguished writer among the Popes.

III.—To the death of Gregory I. (the Great). Chris-

A.D. 604. tianity is not only the religion of the Roman or Italian, but in part of the barbarian world.

Now takes place the league of Christianity with Bar-

barism. The old Roman letters and arts die away into almost total extinction. So fallen is Roman literature, that Boethius is a great philosopher, Cassiodorus a great historian, Prudentius, Fortunatus, Juvenius great poets. The East has made its last effort to unite the Christian world under one dominion. Justinian has aspired to legislate for Christendom. Monastic Christianity, having received a strong impulse from St. Benedict, is in the ascendant. Gregory I. as a Pope, and as a writer, offers himself as a model of its excellencies and defects.

IV.—To the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor of the West. Mohammed and Mohammedanism arise. The East and Egypt are severed from Greek, Africa and Spain from Latin Christianity. Anglo-Saxon Britain, Western and Southern Germany are Christian. Iconoclasm in the East finally separates Greek and Latin Christianity. The Pope has become the great power in Italy. The Gothic kingdom, the Greek dominion of Justinian, have passed away. The Pope seeks an alliance against the Lombards with the Transalpine kings. Charlemagne is Patrician of Rome and Emperor of the West. A.D. 800.

V.—The Empire of Charlemagne. The mingled Temporal and Ecclesiastical supremacy of Charlemagne breaks up at his death. Under his successors the spiritual supremacy, in part the temporal, falls to the clergy. Growth of the Transalpine hierarchy. Pope Nicholas the First accepts the false decretals. Invasion of the Northmen. The dark ages of the Papacy lower and terminate in the degradation of the Popes into slaves of the lawless Barons of the Romagna. A.D. 896.

VI.—The line of German Pontiffs. The Transalpine powers interpose, rescue the Papacy from its threatened dissolution, from the hatred and contempt of mankind. For great part of a century foreign ecclesiastics are seated on the Papal throne.

VII.—The restoration of the Italian Papacy under Gregory VII. (Hildebrand). The Pontificates of his immediate predecessors and successors. Now commences the complete organisation of the sacerdotal caste as independent of, and claiming superiority to, all temporal powers. The strife of centuries ends in the enforced celibacy of the clergy. Berengar disputes Transubstantiation. Urban II. places himself at the head of Christendom on the occasion of the first Crusade.

VIII.—Continuation of contest about Investitures. Intellectual movement. Erigena. Gotschalk. Anselm. Abelard. Arnold of Brescia. Strong revival of Monasticism. Stephen Harding. St. Bernard. Strife in England for immunities of the clergy. Thomas à Becket. Rise of the Emperors of the line of Hohenstaufen. Frederick Barbarossa.

IX.—Meridian of the Papal power under Innocent III. Innocent aspires to rule all the kingdoms of the West. Latin conquest of Constantinople. Wars of the Albigenes. St. Dominic. St. Francis.

X.—The successors of Innocent III. wage an internecine conflict with the Emperors. Fruitless and premature attempt at emancipation under Frederick II. The Decretals, the Palladium of the Papal power, are collected, completed, promulgated as the law of Christendom by Gregory IX. Continued

conflict of the Papal and Sacerdotal against the Imperial and Secular power. Innocent IV. Innocent IV. died 1254. Fall of the House of Hohenstaufen.

XI.—The Empire is crushed and withdraws into its Teutonic sphere. The French descend into Italy. In the King of France arises a new adversary to the Pope. Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. Boniface dies 1303. close the open strife of the temporal and spiritual power.

XII.—The Popes are become the slaves of France at Avignon. What is called the Babylonian captivity of seventy years. Clement V. A.D. 1305 to 1370. abolishes the Templars. The Empire resumes its claims on Italy. Henry of Luxemburg. Louis of Bavaria. John XXII. and the Fraticelli. Rienzi.

XIII.—Restoration to Rome. The great Schism. Councils of Pisa, of Constance, of Basil, of Florence—the Councils advance a claim to supremacy over the Popes. Last attempt to reconcile Greek and Latin Christianity. Popes begin to be patrons of Letters and Arts.

XIV.—Retrospect of Mediæval Letters and Arts. Revival of Greek Letters.

CONCLUSION.—Advance of the Reformation. Teutonic Christianity aspires and begins to divide the world with Latin Christianity.

Like almost all the great works of nature and of human power in the material world and in the world of man, the Papacy grew up in silence and obscurity. The names of the earlier Bishops of Rome are known only

by barren lists,* by spurious decrees and epistles inscribed, centuries later, with their names; by their collision with the teachers of heretical opinions, almost all of whom found their way to Rome; by martyrdoms ascribed with the same lavish reverence to those who lived under the mildest of the Roman emperors, as well as those under the most merciless persecutors.^f Yet the mythic or imaginative spirit of early Christianity has either respected, or was not tempted to indulge its creative fertility by the primitive annals of Rome. After the embellishment, if not the invention, of St. Peter's Pontificate, his conflict with Simon Magus in the presence of the Emperor, and the circumstance of his martyrdom, it was content with raising the successive bishops to the rank of martyrs without any peculiar richness or fulness of legend.^g

* The catalogue published by Bucherius, called also Liberianus, is generally the most accredited. M. Bunsen promises a revision of the whole question. (Hippolytus, i. 279.) Historically the chronological discrepancies in these lists are of no great importance. But it is remarkable that almost all the earlier names are Greek; Clemens, Pius, Victor, Caius, are among the very few genuine Roman.

^f In a list of Popes, published by Fabricius (*Bibliotheca Græca*, xi. p. 794), from St. Peter to Sylvester, two unhappy pontiffs alone (who are acknowledged to be Greeks) are excluded from the honours of martyrdom, Dionysius and Eusebius. It might seem that this list was composed after Greek and Latin Christianity had become hostile. As an illustration of the worthlessness of these

traditions, Telesphorus is reckoned as a martyr on the authority of Irenæus (i. ii., c. 3; compare note of Fenar-dentius). But Telesphorus was bishop of Rome during the reign of Hadrian; his martyrdom is ascribed to the first year of Antoninus Pius. Their character, as well as the general voice of Christian history (see *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 151, 156), absolves these emperors from the charge of persecution.

^g Two remarkable passages greatly weaken, or rather utterly destroy the authority of all the older Roman martyrologies. In the book, *De libris recipiendis*, ascribed to the pontificate of Damasus, of Hormisdas, more probably to that of Gelasius, the caution of the Roman Church, in not publicly reading the martyrologies is highly praised, their writers being unknown

It would be singularly curious and instructive to trace, if it were possible, the rise and growth of any single Christian community, more especially that of Rome, at once in the whole church, and in the lives of the bishops; the first initiatory movements in the conquest of the world, and of the mistress of the world, by the religion of Christ. How did the Church enlarge her sphere in Rome? how, out of the population (from a million to a million and a half),^b slowly gather in her tens, her hundreds, her thousands of converts? By what processes, by what influences, by what degrees did the Christians creep onward towards dangerous, towards equal, towards superior numbers? How did they find access to the public ear, the public mind, the public heart? How were they looked upon by the government (after the Neronian persecution), with what gradations, or alternations of contempt, of indifference, of suspicion, of animosity? When were they entirely separated and distinguished in general opinion from the Jewish communities? When

Obscurity of
the first progress of
Christianity.

and without authority. Singulari cautela a S. Rom. Ecclesiâ non leguntur, quia et eorum qui conscripserint nomina penitus ignorantur, et ab infidelibus vel idiotis superflua aut minus apta quam rei ordo fuerit esse putantur The authors "Deo magis quam hominibus noti sunt." Apud Mansi, sub Pont. Gelasii, A.D. 492, 496. Gregory I. makes even a more ingenuous confession, that excepting one small volume (a calendar, it should seem, of the names and days on which they were honoured) there were no Acts of Martyrs in the archives of the Roman See or in the libraries of Rome.

Præter illa, quæ in ejusdem Eusebii libris (doubtless the de Martyr. Palæst. of the historian), de gestis sanctorum martyrum continentur, nulla in archivis hujus nostræ Ecclesiæ vel in Romanæ urbis bibliothecis esse cognovi, nisi pauca quædam in unius codicis volumine collecta, *et seqq.* Greg. M. Epist. viii. 29.

^b Notwithstanding the arguments of M. Dureau de la Malle, Mr. Merivale, and other learned writers who have also investigated this subject, I still think the estimate of Gibbon the most probable.

did they altogether cease to Judaize? From what order, from what class, from what race did they chiefly make their proselytes? Where and by what channels did they wage their strife with the religion, where with the philosophy of the times? To what extent were they permitted or disposed to hold public discussion? or did the work of conversion spread in secret from man to man? When did their worship emerge from the obscurity of a private dwelling; or have its edifices, like the Jewish synagogues, recognised as sacred fanes? Were they, to what extent, and how long, a people dwelling apart within their own usages, and retiring from social communion with their kindred, and with the rest of mankind?

Rome must be imagined in the vastness and multifariousness of its social condition, the mingling and confusion of races, languages, conditions, in order to conceive the slow, imperceptible, yet continuous aggression of Christianity. Amid the affairs of the universal empire, the perpetual revolutions, which were constantly calling up new dynasties or new masters over the world, the pomp and state of the Imperial palace, the commerce, the business flowing in from all parts of the world, the bustle of the Basilicas or courts of law, the ordinary religious ceremonies, or the more splendid rites on signal occasions, which still went on, if with diminishing concourse of worshippers, with their old sumptuousness, magnificence, and frequency, the public games, the theatres, the gladiatorial shows, the Lucullan or Apician banquets,—Christianity was gradually withdrawing from the heterogeneous mass some of all orders, even slaves, out of the vices, the ignorance, the misery of that corrupted social system. It was ever instilling feelings of humanity yet unknown or coldly commended by an

impotent philosophy, among men and women, whose infant ears had been habituated to the shrieks of dying gladiators; it was giving dignity to minds prostrated by years, almost centuries, of degrading despotism; it was nurturing purity and modesty of manners in an unspeakable state of depravation; it was enshrining the marriage bed in a sanctity long almost entirely lost, and rekindling to a steady warmth the domestic affections; it was substituting a simple, calm, and rational faith and worship for the worn out superstitions of heathenism; gently establishing in the soul of man the sense of immortality, till it became a natural and inextinguishable part of his moral being.

The dimness and obscurity which veiled the growing church, no doubt threw its modest concealment over the person of the Bishop. He was Obscurity of the Bishop of Rome. but one man, with no recognised function, in the vast and tumultuous population. He had his unmarked dwelling, perhaps in the distant Transteverine region, or in the then lowly and unfrequented Vatican. By the vulgar, he was beheld as a Jew, or as belonging to one of those countless Eastern religions, which, from the commencement of the Empire, had been flowing, each with its strange rites and mysteries, into Rome. The Emperor, the Imperial family, the court favourites, the military commanders, the Consulars, the Senators, the Patricians by birth, wealth or favour, the Pontiffs, the great lawyers, even those who ministered to the public pleasures, the distinguished mimes or gladiators, when they appeared in the streets, commanded more public attention than the Christian Bishop, except when sought out for persecution by some politic or fanatic Emperor. Slowly, and at long intervals, did the Bishop of Rome emerge to dangerous eminence. Yet, was there not more real greatness, a more solemn testimony to his

faith in Christ, in this calm and steadfast patience which awaited the tardy accomplishment of the divine promises, than if, as he is sometimes described by the fond reverence of later Roman writers, he had already laid claim to supreme power over expanding Christianity, or had been held of sufficient importance to be constantly exposed to death? The Bishop of Rome could not but be conscious that he was chief minister in the capital of the world of a religion which was confronting Paganism in all its power and majesty. His faith was constantly looking forward to the time, when (if not anticipated by the more appalling triumph at the coming of Christ in His glory) that vast fabric of idolatry, in its strength and wealth, hallowed by the veneration of ages, with all its temples, pomps, theatres, priesthood, its crimes and its superstitions, and besides this, all the wisdom of the philosophic aristocracy, would crumble away; and the successor of the Galilean fisherman or the persecuted Jew be recognised as the religious sovereign of the Christianised city. The peaceful head of a small community (small comparatively with the believers in the old religions or the believers in none), even though, like the Apostle, he may have had some converts in high places, "in Caesar's household," yet who had no doubt in the future universality of Christianity, and who was content to pursue his noiseless course of beneficence and conversion, is a nobler example of true Christianity, than he who, in the excitement of opposition to power, and in the absorbing but brief agony of martyrdom, laid down his life for the Cross.

Christianity, indeed, might seem, even from the first, to have disdained obscurity—to have sprung
Persecution of Nero. up or to have been forced into terrible notoriety in the Neronian persecution and the subsequent martyrdom of one at least, according to the vulgar tra-

dition, of its two great Apostles. What caprice of cruelty directed the attention of Nero to the Christians, and made him suppose them victims important enough to glut the popular indignation at the burning of Rome, it is impossible to determine: (the author has ventured on a bold conjecture, and adheres to his own paradox).ⁱ The cause and extent of the Domitian persecution is equally obscure. The son of Vespasian was not likely to be merciful to any connected with the fanatic Jews. Its known victims were of the imperial family, against whom some crime was necessary, and an accusation of Christianity served the end.^k

Of Domitian.

At the commencement of the second century, under Trajan, persecution against the Christians is *Roman Church under Trajan.* raging in the East. That, however (I feel increased confidence in the opinion), was a local, or rather Asiatic persecution, arising out of the vigilant and not groundless apprehension of the sullen and brooding preparation for insurrection among the whole Jewish race (with whom Roman terror and hatred still confounded the Christians), which broke out in the bloody massacres of Cyrene and Cyprus, and in the final rebellion, during the reign of Hadrian, under Barchochebas. But while Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is carried to Rome to suffer martyrdom, the Roman community is in peace, and not without influence. Ignatius entreats his Roman brethren not to interfere with injurious kindness between himself and his glorious death.^m

ⁱ Hist. of Christianity, i. p. 456.

^k Ibid., ii. p. 11.

^m Φοβοῦμαι γὰρ τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγαπὴν, μὴ αὐτὴ με ἀδικήσῃ, ὑμῖν γὰρ εὐχερὲς ἔστιν ὃ θέλετε ποιῆσαι.—p. 41. Ἐγὼ γράφω πάσαις ταῖς

ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐντέλλομαι πᾶσιν ὅτι.

ἐγὼ ἐκὼν ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω,

ἐάνπερ ὑμεῖς μὴ κωλύσῃτέ (με).

Παρακαλῶ ὑμεῖς μὴ (ἐν) εὐνοίᾳ

ἀκαίρῳ γέννησθέ μοι . . .—Corpus Ig-

natianum a Cueton, p. 45. I quote

The wealth of the Roman community, and their lavish Christian use of their wealth, by contributing to the wants of foreign churches, at all periods, especially in times of danger and disaster (an ancient usage which lasted till the time of Eusebius), testifies at once to their flourishing condition, to their constant communication with more distant parts of the empire,^a and thus incidentally, perhaps, to the class, the middle or mercantile class, which formed the greater part of the believers.

But the history of Latin Christianity has not begun.

Church of
Rome Greek.

For some considerable (it cannot but be an undefinable) part of the three first centuries, the Church of Rome, and most, if not all the churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organisation Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek; and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual, their Liturgy was Greek. Through Greek the communication of the churches of Rome and of the West was constantly kept up with the East; and through Greek every heresiarch, or his disciples, having found his way to Rome, propagated, with more or less success, his peculiar doctrines. Greek was the commercial language throughout the empire; by which the Jews, before the destruction of their city, already so widely

Mr. Cureton's Syriac Ignatius, not feeling that the larger copies have equal historical authority.

^a The first notice of this is in the latter half of the second century, during the bishopric of Soter, either 173-177, or 168-176, as appears from the letter of Dionysius of Corinth, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῦτο.

He calls it also *πατριπαράδοτον ἔθος*.—Euseb. H. E. iv. 23. It continued during the Decian persecution; Syria and Arabia are described as rejoicing in the bounty of Rome. H. E. vii. 5. Eusebius himself speaks of it as lasting to his time. τὸ μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ φυλαχθεῖς Ῥωμαίων ἔθος.

disseminated through the world, and altogether engaged in commerce, carried on their affairs.* The Greek Old Testament was read in the synagogues of the foreign Jews. The churches, formed sometimes on the foundation, to a certain extent on the model, of the synagogues, would adhere for some time, no doubt, to their language. The Gospels and the Apostolic writings, so soon as they became part of the public worship, would be read, as the Septuagint was, in their original tongue. All the Christian extant writings which appeared in Rome and in the West are Greek, or were originally Greek,^p the Epistles of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies; the works of Justin Martyr, down to Caius and Hippolytus

* At the commencement of the second century, from the time of the great peace, which followed the victories of Trajan, and which, with some exceptions, occupied the whole reign of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, till the Marcomannic war; when the Cæsars had become cosmopolitan sovereigns of the Roman Empire, rather than emperors of Rome; Greek, in letters, appears to have assumed a complete ascendancy. Greek literature has the names of Plutarch, Appian, Arrian, Herodian (the historian), Lucian, Pausanias, Dion Cassius, Galen, Sextus Empiricus, Epictetus, Ptolemy. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his philosophy in Greek. The poets, such as they were, chiefly of the didactic class, Oppian, Nicander, are Greeks. (See, in Fynes Clinton's Appendix to Fasti Romani, the catalogue of Greek authors.) Latin literature might seem to have been in a

state of suspended animation after Quintilian, the Plinys, and Tacitus. Not merely are there no writers of name who have survived, but there hardly seem to have been any. From Juvenal to Claudian there is scarcely a poet. The fragments of Fronto, lately discovered, do not make us wish for more of a writer who had greater fame than most of his day. Apuleius was an African.

Jurisprudence alone maintained the dignity and dominion of Latin. The great lawyers, Ulpian, Paulus, and their colleagues, are the only famous writers. Latin law alone, of Latin letters, was studied in the schools of the East. The Greek writers of the day were many of them ignorant of Latin.

^p Uebrigens war die Griechische Sprache noch fast die einzige Kirchensprache. Gieseler, i. p. 203. (Compare the passage.)

the author of the Refutation of All Heresies. The Octavius of Minucius Felix,^a and the Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity, are the earliest known works of Latin Christian literature which came from Rome. So was it too in Gaul: there the first Christians were settled chiefly in the Greek cities, which owned Marseilles as their parent, and which retained the use of Greek as their vernacular tongue. Irenæus wrote in Greek; the account of the Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne is in Greek. Vestiges of the old Greek ritual long survived not only in Rome, but also in some of the Gallic churches. The Kyrie eleison still lingers in the Latin service.^r The singular fact related by the historian Sozomen, that, for the first centuries, there was no public preaching in Rome, here finds its explanation. Greek was the ordinary language of the community, but among the believers and worshippers may have been Latins, who understood not, or understood imperfectly, the Greek. The Gospel or sacred writings were explained according to the capacities of the persons present. Hippolytus

^a Some place the Octavius in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, others between Tertullian and Cyprian. Gieseher, note, p. 207.

^r Martene, de Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus, i. p. 102. he quotes the anonymous Turonus. Nos canimus illud Græcè juxta morem antiquum Romanæ ecclesiæ, cui tam Græci quam Latini solebant antiquitus deservire, et a Græcis habitabatur maxima pars Italiæ, *et seqq.* This is evidence for the Church of Tours. It is by no means clear when the Latin service began, even in Rome. There is much further illustration of the co-existence of the Latin and Greek service in the

West, to a late period. Compare Martene, iii. 35. The Epistle and Gospel were read in both languages to a late period. Mabillon, Iter Italicum, ii. pp. 168 and 453. In Southern Gaul Latin had not entirely dispossessed Greek in the fifth century: Greek was still spoken by part of the population of Ailes. (See Fauriel, Gaule Méridionale, i. p. 432.) A Saint Martial de Limoges on chantait en Grec dans le x. siècle à la Messe du jour de la Pentecôte le Gloria, le Sanctus, l'Agnus, &c. Ce fait est établi par un MS. de la Bibliothèque Royale, 4° 4458. Jourdain, Traductions d'Aristote, p. 44.

indeed composed, probably delivered, homilies in Greek, in imitation of Origen, who, when at Rome, may have preached in Greek; and this is spoken of as something new. Pope Leo I. was the first celebrated Latin preacher, and his brief and emphatic sermons read like the first essays of a rude and untried eloquence, rather than the finished compositions which would imply a long study and cultivation of pulpit oratory. Compare them with Chrysostom.^a

Africa,^b not Rome, gave birth to Latin Christianity. Tertullian was the first Latin writer, at least the first who commanded the public ear; and there is strong ground for supposing that, since Tertullian quotes the sacred writings perpetually and copiously, the earliest of those many Latin versions noticed by Augustine and on which Jerome grounded his Vulgate, were African.^c Cyprian kept up the tra-

440-461.

Africa parent
of Latin
Christianity.

^a In Rome neither the Bishop nor any one else publicly preached to the people, οὕτε δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὕτε ἄλλος τις ἔνθαδε ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας διδάσκει. H. E. vii. 19. In Alexandria the Bishop alone preached. Compare Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. i. p. 318.

^b Of Africa Greek was the general language no further East than the Cyrenaica; westward the old Punic language prevailed, even where the Roman conquerors had superinduced Latin. Even Tertullian wrote also in Greek. Latinè quoque ostendam virgines nostras velari oportere. (De Virgin. veland.) Sed et huic materne propter suavitudinis nostros Græco quoque stylo satisfacimus. De Coron. Mil. vi.

^c Vetus hæc interpretatio vix dubitari potest quin inter eam gentem quæ Græcæ linguæ minimè perita esset, nata fuerit, hoc est in Africâ. Lachman, Pref. in Nov. Test. Lachman quotes a learned Dissertation of Cardinal Wiseman as conclusive on this point. In this Dissertation (reprinted in his Essays, London, 1854) the author ventures on the forlorn hope of the vindication of the disputed text in St. John's Epistle. I can only express my surprise that so acute a writer should see any force in such arguments. But the Dissertation on African Latinity appears to me valuable, scholarlike, and sound. The dubious passage of St. Augustine, on which alone rests the tradition of the *Versio Italica*, I would read, after

dition of ecclesiastical Latin. Arnobius, too, was an African.*

Thus the Roman church was but one of the confederation of Greek religious republics, founded by Christianity. As of Apostolic origin, still more as the church of the capital of the world, it was, of course, of paramount dignity and importance. It is difficult to exaggerate the height at which Rome, before the foundation of Constantinople, stood above the other cities of the earth; the centre of commerce, the centre of affairs, the centre of empire. The Christians, like the rest of mankind, were constantly ebbing and flowing out of Rome and into Rome. The church of the capital could not but assume something of the dignity of the capital; it was constantly receiving, as it were, the homage of all the foreign Christians, who, from interest, business, ambition, curiosity, either visited or took up their residence in the Eternal City.

The Roman Church, if it had become prematurely Latin, would have been isolated and set apart from the rest of Christendom; remaining Greek, it became also the natural and inevitable centre of Christianity. The public documents of the Christian world spoke throughout the same language; no interpretation was neces-

Bentley, as Bishop Marsh and most of the later biblical scholars, *Illu.*—Marsh's Introduction, note, vol. ii. p. 623.

I would suggest, as a curious investigation, if it has not yet been executed by any competent scholar (which I presume not to assert), a critical comparison of the Latinity of the old version, as published by Sabatier, and

even of the Vulgate, with the Latin of Tertullian, Cyprian, Apuleius of Madaura, and other African writers.

* Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius are to the Greek divines what Cicero was to the Greek philosophers—writers of popular abstracts in that which in his hands was, in theirs aspired to be, elegant Latin.

sary between the East and the West.⁷ To the unity of the Church this was of infinite importance. The Roman Christians and their Bishop were the constituted guardians and protectors of what may be called the public interests of Christianity. In Rome they beheld, or had the earliest intelligence of, every revolution in the empire; they had the first cognisance of all the Imperial edicts which might affect the brethren. On them, even if they had no access to the counsels or to the palace of the Emperor, on their influence, on their conduct, might in some degree depend the fate of Christendom. They were in the van, the first to foresee the threatened persecution, the first to suffer. The Bishop of Rome, so long as the Emperor ruled in Rome, was at once in the post of the greatest distinction, and in that of the greatest difficulty and danger. The Christian world would look with trembling interest on his conduct, as his example might either glorify or disgrace the Church; on his prudence or his temerity, on his resolution or on his weakness, might depend the orders despatched to every prefect or proconsul in the Empire. Local oppressions or local persecutions would be confined to a city or a province; in Rome might be the signal for general proscription. The eyes of all Christendom must thus have constantly been fixed on Rome and on the Roman Bishop.

But if Rome, or the Church of Rome, was thus the centre of the more peaceful influences of Christianity, and of the hopes and fears of the Christian world, it was no less inevitably the chosen battle field of her civil

⁷ As late as the middle of the third century, after the Novatian schism, as something new and extraordinary that letters from Cyprian to the Pope Cornelius writes in Greek to Asiatic bishops are in Latin. H. E. Fabius of Antioch. Eusebius records vi. 43.

wars; and Christianity has ever more faithfully recorded
 her dissensions than her conquests. In Rome
 every feud which distracted the infant com-
 munity reached its height; nowhere do the
 Judaising tenets seem to have been more obstinate,
 or to have held so long and stubborn a conflict with
 more full and genuine Christianity. In Rome every
 heresy, almost every heresiarch, found welcome recep-
 tion. All new opinions, all attempts to harmonise
 Christianity with the tenets of the Greek philosophers,
 with the Oriental religions, the Cosmogonies, the Theo-
 phanies, and Mysteries of the East, were boldly agi-
 tated, either by the authors of the Gnostic
 systems or by their disciples. Valentinus the
 Alexandrian was himself in Rome, so also was Marcion
 of Sinope. The Phrygian Montanus, with his pro-
 phetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, if not present, had
 their sect, a powerful sect, in Rome and in Africa. In
 Rome their convert, for a time at least, was the Pope;
 in Africa, Tertullian. Somewhat later, the precursors
 of the great Trinitarian controversy came from all
 quarters. Praxeas, an Asiatic; Theodotus, a Byzan-
 tine; Artemon, an Asiatic; Noetus, a Smyrniote, at
 least his disciples, the Deacon Epigenes and Cleomenes,
 taught at Rome. Sabellius, from Ptolemais in Cyrene,
 appeared in person; his opinions took their full develop-
 ment in Rome. Not only do all these controversies
 betray the inexhaustible fertility of the Greek or Eastern
 imagination, not only were they all drawn from Greek
 or Oriental doctrines, but they must have been still
 agitated, discussed, ramified into their parts and divi-
 sions, through the versatile and subtile Greek. They
 were all strangers and foreigners; not one of all
 these systems originated in Rome, in Italy, or in

Centre of
Christian
controversies.

About
A.D. 140.

Africa.* On all these opinions the Bishop of Rome was almost compelled to sit in judgment; he must receive or reject, authorise or condemn; he was a proselyte, whom it would be the ambition of all to gain. No one unfamiliar with Greek, no one not to a great extent Greek by birth, by education, or by habit, could in any degree comprehend the conflicting theories.

The Judaising opinions, combated by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, maintained their ground among some of the Roman Christians for above a century or more after that Apostle's death. A remarkable monument attests their power and vitality. There can be slight doubt that the author of that singular work, commonly called the Clementina, was a Roman, or rather a Greek domiciled in Rome.^a Its origin is almost proved by the choice of the hero in this earliest of religious romances. Clement, who sets forth as a heathen philosopher in search of truth, becomes the companion of St. Peter in the East, the witness of his long and stubborn strife with his great adversary, Simon the Magician; and if the letter prefixed to the work be a genuine part of it,^b becomes

Judaising
Christianity

The Cle-
mentina.

* A passage of Aulus Gellius illustrates the conscious inadequacy of the Latin to express, notwithstanding the innovations of Cicero, the finer distinctions of the Greek philosophy: *Hæc Favorinum dicentem audiavi Græcæ oratione, cujus sententias, quantum meminisse potui, retuli. Amœnitates vero et copias ubertatesque verborum, Latina omnis facundia vix quidem indispisci potuerit.* Noct. Att. xii. Favorinus, of the time of Hadrian, was a

native of Arles in Gaul.

^a This is the unanimous opinion of those who, in later days, have critically investigated the Clementina—Schleiman, Neander, Baur, Gieseler. *ἔγὼ Κλήμης Ῥωμαῖος ὁ ν*, in init. This does not prove much.

^b I entertain some doubt on this point. A good critical edition of this work, in its various forms, is much to be desired.*

* There are now two good editions of the Clementina—1 by Schwieger, Stuttgart, 1877; 2 The last and best, by Dressel, Göttingen, 1853; besides, 3. The Latin translation of Rufinus, by Gerardo, Leipzig, 1838.

the successor of St. Peter in the see of Rome. It bears in its front, and throughout, the character of a romance : it can hardly be considered even as mythic history. Its groundwork is that so common in the latest Greek and in the Latin comedy, and in the Greek novels ; adventures of persons cast away at sea, and sold into slavery ; lost children by strange accident restored to their parents, husbands to their wives ; amusing scenes in what we may call the middle or mercantile life of the times. It might seem borrowed, in its incidents, from a play of Plautus or Terence, or from their originals ; a kind of type of the *Æthiopics* of Bishop Heliodorus, or the *Charea* and *Callirhoe*. The religious interest is still more remarkable, and no doubt faithfully represents the views and tenets of a certain sect or class of Christians. It is the work of a Judaising Christian, according to a very peculiar form of Ebionitism.* The scene is chiefly laid in Palestine and its neighbourhood, its original language is Greek. The views of the author as to the rank, influence, and relative position of the Apostles, is among its most singular characteristics. So far from ascribing any primacy to St. Peter, though St. Peter is throughout the leading personage, James, Bishop of Jerusalem, is the acknowledged head of Christendom, the arbiter of Christian doctrine, the Bishop of Bishops, to whom Peter himself bows with submissive reverence. Of any earlier visits of Peter to Rome the author is ignorant. Clement encounters the Apostle in Palestine ; in Palestine or in the East is carried on the whole strife with Simon Magus. Yet Peter is the Apostle of the Gentiles, to Peter the heathens owe their Christianity. More than this, there

* This is abundantly proved by Schlicman and by Neander

is a bitter hatred to St. Paul, which betrays itself in brief, covert, sarcastic allusion, not to be mistaken in its object or aim.^d The whole purpose of the work is to assert a Petrine, a Judaising, an anti-Pauline Christianity. The Gospel is but a republication of the Law, that is, the pure, genuine, original Law, which emanated from God. God is light, his Wisdom or his Spirit (these are identified and are both the Son of God) has dwelt in different men, from Adam to Jesus. The whole world is one vast system of Dualisms, or Antagonisms. The antagonism of Simon Magus to St. Peter is chiefly urged in the Clementine homilies; but there are manifest hints, more perhaps than hints, of a second antagonism between Peter and Paul, the teacher of Christianity with the Law, and the teacher of Christianity without the Law. Here then is the representative of what can scarcely be supposed an insignificant party in Rome (the various forms, reconstructions, and versions in which the Clementina appear, whole, or in fragments, attest their wide-spread popularity) who does not scruple to couple fiction with the most sacred names. Of the whole party it must have been the obvious interest to exalt St. Peter, to assert him as the founder, the Bishop of the true Church in Rome; and it is certainly singular that in all the early traditions, which are more than allusions to St. Peter at Rome, Simon Magus appears as his shadow. Has, then, the myth grown out

^d In the letter of St. Peter, *τινὲς γὰρ τῶν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν, τὸ δι' ἐμοῦ νόμιμον ἀπεδοκίμασαν κήρυγμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκάμενοι διδασκαλίαν*. If we could doubt that

here St. Paul, not Simon Magus is meant, the allusions xi. 35, xvii. 19, and elsewhere, to the very acts and words of St. Paul are conclusive. Compare Schlieman, *Die Clementine* 74, 96, 534, &c.

of the pure fiction, or is the fiction but an expansion of the myth ?*

At all events these works are witnesses to the perpetuity and strength, to a late period, of these Judaizing opinions in Rome.^f Their fictitious form in no way invalidates their authority as expressing living opinions tenets and sentiments. If not Roman (I have slight doubt on this head), there is an attestation to the wide spread oppugnancy of a Petrine and a Pauline party ; to strong divergence of opinion as to the relative rank and dignity of the Apostles.

Out of the antagonism between Judaic and anti-Judaic Christianity arose the first conflict, in which the Bishop of Rome, as the leader of a great part of the Christian confederation, assumed unwonted authority. Difference of opinion did not necessarily lead to open strife—from difference of observance it was

unavoidable. The controversy about the time of keeping Easter, or rather the Paschal Feast, had slept from the days of Polycarp and Anicetus of Rome. Towards the close of the second century it broke out again. Rome, it is remarkable, now held the anti-Judaic usage of the variable feast, and in this concurred with the churches of Palestine, of Cæsarea, and Jerusalem. These were chiefly of Gentile descent, and probably from near neighbourhood to the Jews were most averse to the usages of that hostile and

* Strictly speaking the authority for Simon Magus being at Rome is earlier than that for St. Peter. The famous passage of Justin Martyr on the inscription Simonis Sancti, is about twenty years older than the Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth (A.D. 171),—

the first *distinct* assertion of St. Peter in Rome. Euseb. H. E. ii. 13, 14.

^f Schlicman assigns the Recognitions to some time between 212 and 230—the Clementine, no doubt, are of an earlier date. p. 327, *et seq.*

odious race. The Asiatic churches had adhered to the ancient Jewish custom, the observance of the 14th day of the month (Nisan). The controversy seems to have been awakened in Rome by one Blastus,^g denounced as endeavouring secretly to enslave the Church to Judaism. The Bishop Victor deposed the obstinate schismatic from the Roman Presbytery. But the A.D. 196. strife was not confined to Rome. The Asiatic Christians, under Polycrates of Ephesus, maintained their own, the Judaic usage, sanctioned, as was asserted, by the martyr Polycarp, by Philip the Deacon, and even by St. John. Victor, supported by the Bishops, Theophilus of the Palestinian Cæsarea, by Narcissus of Jerusalem, by some in Pontus, in Osroene, in Gaul, and by Bacchylides of Corinth, peremptorily demanded a Council to judge the Asiatic Bishops; threatened or actually pronounced a disruption of all communion with those who presumed to maintain their stubborn difference from himself and the rest of the Christian world.^h The strife was appeased by the interposition of Irenæus, justly, according to the Ecclesiastical historian, called a Man of Peace. Irenæus was Bishop of Vienne in Gaul; and so completely is Christianity now one world, that a Bishop of Gaul allays a feud in which the Bishop of Rome is in alliance with the Bishops of Syria and of the remoter East, against those of Asia Minor. Africa does not look with indifference on the controversy. Irenæus had already written an epistle to Blastus in Rome, reproving him as author of the schism: he now wrote to the Bishop Victor, asserting the right

^g Est præterea his omnibus Blastus accedens, qui latenter Judaismum vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem Moysi xiiii mensis.—Præscript.

Hæret. This is from an addition, probably an ancient one, to the treatise of Tertullian.

^h Euseb. H. E. v. 15.

of the Churches to maintain their own usages on such points, and recommending a milder tone on these ceremonial questions.¹

It was not till the Council of Nicæa that Christendom acquiesced in the same Paschal Cycle.

The reign of Commodus, commencing with the last ^{reign of} ~~reign of~~ Commodus, ¹⁸⁰⁻¹⁹² in the history of Western Christendom. The feud between the Judaising and anti-Judaising parties in Rome seemed to expire with the controversy about Easter. The older Gnostic systems of Valentinus and Marcion had had their day. Montanism was expelled from Rome to find refuge in Africa. In Africa Latin Christianity began to take its proper form in the writings of Tertullian. Rome was absorbed in the inevitable disputes concerning the Divinity of the Saviour, the prelude to the great Trinitarian controversy. The Bishops of Rome, Eleutherius, still more Victor, and at the commencement of the third century Zephyrinus and Callistus, before dimly known by scattered allusions in Tertullian and Eusebius, and still later writers, have suddenly emerged into light in the contemporary work, justly, to all appearance, attributed to Hippolytus Bishop of Portus.^k

¹ The Latin book ascribed to Novatian, against the Jewish distinction of meats, shows Judaism still struggling within the church on its 'most vital peculiarities. The author of this tract wrote also against circumcision and the Jewish Sabbath.

^k The Chevalier Bunsen's very learned work has proved the authorship of Hippolytus to my full satisfaction—so likewise Dr. Wordsworth—Hippolytus. I have also read the

'Hippolytus und Kallistus' by J. Döllinger, the church historian; I must say with no conviction but of the author's learning and ingenuity. It appears to me that M. Döllinger's arguments against M. Bunsen (*e.g.* from the ignorance of St. Jerome) are quite as fatal to his own theory. I still think it most probable that Hippolytus was Bishop of Portus, and that these suburbicarian bishops formed or were part of a kind of presbytery or college with the

The Christians from the death of M. Aurelius throughout the reign of Commodus, enjoyed undisturbed peace with the civil government.^m *Maximian*
But many of the victims of the persecution under

bishops of Rome. I hardly understand how those (seven) bishops (the cardinal-bishops) can have gained their peculiar relation to Rome, in later times, without any earlier tradition in their favour. The loose language of later Greek writers might easily make of a bishop, a member of such a Presbytery, a bishop in Rome, or even of Rome. More than one, at least, of these writers calls Hippolytus Bishop of Portus: and hence, too, he may have been sometimes described as Presbyter.

Portus, there can be no doubt, was a very considerable town; but a new and flourishing haven cannot have grown up at the mouth of the Tiber, after half, at least, of the commerce and concourse of strangers had deserted Rome, after the foundation of Constantinople, and during the Barbarian invasions. Birkenhead would not have risen to rival Liverpool excepting in a most prosperous state of English trade.

I cannot but regret that M. Dollinger's book, so able, and in some respects so instructive, should be written with such a resolute (no doubt conscientious) determination to make out a case. It might well be entitled *Apologia pro Callisto*; and I must presume to say, in my judgment, a most unfortunate case for his own cause. Were I polemically disposed as to the succession to the Papacy, the authority and supremacy of the Bishop of

Rome, or even the unity of the Church, I could hardly hope for so liberal a concession as that twice within thirty years, during the early part of the third century, rival bishops, one a most distinguished theologian, should set themselves up in Rome itself against the acknowledged Pope, and declare their own communities to be the true Church. Dollinger indeed could not but see that, whoever the author, he writes, from station, from character, or from influence, as quite on a level with the Pope; he seems altogether unconscious of awe, and even of the respect for that office, which is of a later period. The Abbé Cruice, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, St. Zephyrin, et de St. Calliste* (Paris, 1856), is bolder and more dutiful. With him the Popes are already invested in all their power (of excommunication), in their *ex officio* wisdom and holiness. They are all, by the magical prefix S, Saints; Victor and Callistus, on the authority of legend, martyrs. This unhistoric history (not unamusing), this theology without precision, seems to pass in France for profound learning.

^m Asterius Urbanus apud Eusebium, H. E. v. 16. Compare Moyle's works, ii. p. 265 — The peace lasted for thirteen years after the death of Maximilla the Montanist, just the period of the reign of Commodus.

Aurelius were pining in the unwholesome mines of Sardinia. Marcia, the favourite concubine of the Emperor Commodus, whom he treated as his wife, and who held the state of an Empress, was favourable to the Christians: how far she herself had embraced the doctrines, how, if herself disposed to Christianity, she reconciled it with her life, does not appear.ⁿ The Bishop Victor did not scruple (such scruples had been too fastidiously rigorous) to employ her influence for the release of his exiled brethren: they all returned to

Discord in
Rome.

Rome.^o This state of peace seemed to thicken into more active life the brooding elements of discord, and to invite the founders of new systems, or their busy proselytes, to Rome. Already had spread to Europe, to Africa, to Rome itself, from the depths of Phrygia, the disciples of Montanus. It is probable that Montanist or kindred prophecies of coming wars, and of the approaching Dissolution of the World (a vaticination which involved or rather signified to the jealous Roman ear only the ruin of the Empire), may have aided in exciting the religious terror and indignation of the philosophic Emperor and of the Roman world against the Christians, and so have been one cause of the persecutions under Marcus

ⁿ οὐδὲν δὲ ἀπέχε γαμετῆς γυναι-
κός, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὑπῆρχεν ὅσα
ζεβάστη πλὴν τοῦ πυρός. Herodian,
i. 50. Her complicity in the murder
of Commodus was but to avert her
own. Commodus must have been
insane; Marcia strove, even with
tears, to dissuade him from the dis-
grace of appearing in public as a
gladiator; his two ministers joined
their strong remonstrances. Commo-

modus, in revenge, marked down her
name, and those of Lætus and Eclectus,
his faithful counsellors, for death.
The fatal tablet fell into the hands of
Marcia. They anticipated their own
doom by that of Commodus. Herodian,
ibid. Marcia afterwards married
Eclectus.—Dion Cassius, or Xiphylin,
Ivii. 4.

^o Refutatio Hæresium, p. 287.

Aurelius.^p Montanus himself, and Maximilla, his chief prophetess, seem not to have travelled beyond the confines of Phrygia.^q But their followers swarmed over Christendom. They dispersed or revealed to the initiated in countless books, the visions of Montanus, and his no less inspired female followers, Priscilla and Maximilla.^r Montanism, strictly speaking, was no heresy; in their notions of God and of Christ, these sectaries departed not from the received doctrine. But beyond, and as the consummation and completion of the Christian Revelation, the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, dwelt in Montanus and the Prophetesses. At intervals, throughout the annals of Christianity, the Holy Ghost has been summoned by the hopes, felt as present by the kindled imaginations, been proclaimed by the passionate enthusiasm of a few, as accomplishing in them the imperfect revelation; as the third revelation—which is to supersede and to fulfil the Law and the Gospel. This notion will appear again in the middle ages as the doctrine of the Abbot Joachim, of John Peter de Oliva and the Fraticelli; in a milder form it is that of George Fox and Barclay. The land of heathen orgies was the natural birthplace of that wild Christian mysticism; it was the Phrygian fanaticism speaking a new language and as the ancient Phrygian rites of Cybele found welcome reception in heathen Rome, so also that, which was appropriately called Cataphrygianism, in the

^p This further confirms the author's view of the cause of the persecutions under M. Aurelius. Hist. of Christianity, Book ii. c. 7.

^q Their fate was so obscure, that rumours spread abroad among their enemies that they had died like Judas,

had hanged themselves. See the uncertain author quoted by Eusebius. H. E. v. 16.

^r This we learn from the Refutatio Hæresium. *Ἐν βιβλοῖς ἀπείροις ἔχοντες πλανῶνται*, p. 275.

Christian Church.* A stern intolerant asceticism, which had already begun to harden around the Christian heart, a rigour, a perfection of manners as of creed (so they deemed it) beyond the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, distinguished the Montanists, who, by their own asserted superiority, condemned the rest of the Christian world.† They had fasts far more long and severe, their own festivals, their own food, chiefly roots;‡ they held the austere views on the connexion of the sexes; if they did not absolutely condemn, hardly permitted marriage; a second marriage was an inextinguishable sin. Their visions enwrap the imagination, their rigour enthralled minds of congenial temperament. They seized on the African passions, they fell in with the austerity, they satisfied the holy ambition of Tertullian, who would not rest below what seemed the most lofty, self-sacrificing Christianity. In Rome itself (so Tertullian writes, with mingled indignation and contempt) the Bishop had been seized with admiration, had acknowledged the inspiration of the Prophets; he had issued letters of peace in their favour, which had tended to quiet the agitated churches of Asia and of Phrygia. But§ at the instigation of Praxeas the Heresiarch, if not the author, among the first teachers of that doctrine, afterwards denounced as Patripassianism, he had revoked his letters, denied their spiritual gifts, and driven out the Prophets in disgrace.¶

* Compare the *Super alta vectus* Atys with the extravagancies of Montanism.

πλείον δὲ αὐτῶν φάσκοντες ὡς μεμαθημένοι, ἢ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τῶν Εὐαγγελίων. Ibid. p. 275.

¶ The author of the *Refutatio* speaks

of their *ξηροφάγια*.

¶ Ita duo negotia Diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, prophetiam expulit et hæresim intulit. Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit. Adversus Praxeam, c. i. Who was this bishop of Rome? It has been usually sup-

The indignation of Tertullian at the rejection of his Montanist opinions urges him to arraign the Pope, with what justice, to what extent we know not, as having embraced the Patripassian opinions of Praxeas. This Monarchianism, or, as it was branded by the more odious name, Patripassianism; was the controversy which raged during the episcopate of Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus.⁷ It called forth the 'Refutation of Heresies.' That paramount doctrine of Christianity, the nature of Christ, his relation to the primal and paternal Godhead, which had been contested in a vaguer and more imaginative form under the Gnostic systems, must be brought to a direct issue. Rome, though the war was waged by Greek combatants in the Greek language, must be the chosen battle-field of the conflict. There was a division in the Church. Pope Victor, a stern and haughty Prelate, who had demanded implicit submission to his opinions on the question of Easter, now seemed stunned and bewildered by the polemic din and tumult.⁸ The feebler Zephyrinus,

posed Victor. Neander (Anti-Gnosticus, p. 486) argues strongly, I think not conclusively, that it was his predecessor Eleutherius. The spurious passage, at the close of the *De Præscrip. Hæret.*, which, though not Tertullian's, seems ancient, has these words:—"Praxeas quidem hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus (the Bishop Victor?) corroborare curavit."

⁷ The oppugnancy of the Latin and Greek mind is well illustrated by the contrast of Tertullian with the early Greek writers, *e. g.* Justin Martyr. In Tertullian there is no courteous respect for the Greek philosophy: he is dead to the beauty of the dying

hours of Socrates; his *Dæmon* is a devil. "No man comes to God but by Christ; of these things the heathen knew nothing." *T. de Anim.* i. 39. Compare Ritter, *Gesch. Christ. Philosophie*, p. 335. Tertullian cannot conceive immaterial being. *Nihil incorporale nisi quod non est.* *De Carn. Christ.* Neander, *in.* p. 965.

⁸ Victor condemned indeed and excommunicated Theodotus, who reduced the Saviour to his naked manhood; he was but an image of Melchisedek. This was asserted fifty years later, when the doctrine of the naked manhood of Christ was taught in its most obnoxious form by Artemas, and after-

through his long pontificate, vacillated and wavered to and fro. Callistus, if we are to believe his implacable and uncompromising adversary, not only departed from the true faith, but left a sect, bearing his name, to perpetuate his reprehensible opinions. From About A.D. 150. Theodotus, a follower of Valentinus, to Noetus and his disciple Epigonus, there was a constant succession of strangers, each with his own system. The shades of distinction were infinite, from that About A.D. 200-220. older Ebionitish or Judaïc doctrine, which kept down the Saviour to mere naked manhood, hardly superior to the prophets; and that which approximated, to, if it did not express in absolute terms, the full Godhead of the Nicene Creed. The broad divisions, up to a certain period, had been threefold: 1. Those who altogether denied the Godhead—the extreme Ebionites. 2. Those who denied the Manhood—all the Gnostic sects. In their diverging forms of Docetism, these held the unreal, or but seeming human nature of the Redeemer; whether as Valentinus said, the Æon Christ had descended on the man Jesus, the psychic or animal man; or as Marcion, maintained the manhood to be a mere phantasm. 3. All the rest (even the Roman Ebionites, represented by the Clementine Homilies)

wards by Paul of Samosata. These teachers appealed to the unbroken tradition of the church, from the Apostles to their own days, in favour of their own tenet. It was answered that Victor had condemned Theodotus, the author of this God-denying apostasy; *ὅτι βίκτωρ τὸν σκυτέα Θεοδότου, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν ταύτης τῆς ἀρησιθεοῦ ἀποστασίας, ἀπεκήρυξε τῆς κοινωνίας, πρῶτον εἰπόντα ψιλὸν*

ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν. Euseb. H. E. v. 15, Epiph. 54, 55. Compare Pseudo-Tertullian de Præscrip. Hæret. On the Theodoti, compare Bunsen, Hippolytus, p. 92. Yet Victor, it should seem, was deceived by Praxeas (see note above). Florinus, condemned with Blastus the Quartodeciman, was a Monarchian; but there were manifestly many shades of Monarchianism.

acknowledged some Deity, some efflux, irradiation, emanation of the primal Godhead. The Logos, the Wisdom, the Spirit of God (the distinction was not always maintained, nor as yet accurately defined) indwelt in various manners and degrees within the Christ. The difficulty was to claim the plenary Godhead for the Son, the Redeemer, without infringing on the sole, original Principality of the Father; to admit subordination without inferiority. So grew up a new division between the Monarchians, the assertors of one immutable primary Principle, who yet acknowledged the divinity of the Redeemer; and those who, while they mostly acknowledged it in terms, were impatient of any real or definite subordination. Each drew an awful conclusion from the tenet of his adversary; each used an opprobrious term which appealed to the resentful passions. The Monarchians were charged with the appalling doctrine, that the Father, the one primary Principle, must have suffered on the cross; they were called Patripassians. They retorted on those who were unable, or who refused to define the subordination of the Son, as worshippers of two Gods, Ditheists. Sabellius, who at first repressed, or brought forward his views with reserve and caution, attempted to mediate, and was disdainfully cast aside by both parties. The notion of the same God under three manifestations, forms, or names, seemed to annul the separate personality of each.*

Pope Victor saw but the beginning of this strife. With Pope Zephyrinus, whose Episcopate of ^{A.D. 201-} nineteen years commences with the third cen- ^{219.} tury, appears his antagonist, the antagonist of his suc-

* Sabellius, according to the Refutation of Heresies, might have been kept within the bounds of orthodoxy, had he not been driven into extremes by the injudicious violence of the Pope.

essor Callistus, the author of the Refutation of all Heresies. According to his own distinct statement, this writer was not a casual and transient visitor in Rome, but domiciled in the city or in its neighbourhood, invested in some high public function,^b and holding acknowledged influence and authority. He describes himself as the head of what may be called the orthodox party, resisting and condemning the wavering policy of one Pope, actually excommunicating another, and handing him down to posterity as an heresiarch of a sect called after his name. Who then was this antagonist?

A.D. 201-
250.

What rank and position did he hold? Fifty years later^c the Roman church comprehended, besides its Bishop, forty-six Presbyters, and seven Deacons,^d with their subordinate officers. Each Presbyter doubtless presided over a separate community, each with its basilica, scattered over the wide circuit of the city: they were the primary Parish Priests of Rome. But besides these, were Suburbicarian Bishops of the adjacent towns, Ostia, Tibur, Portus, and others (six or seven), who did not maintain their absolute independence on the metropolis, each in the seclusion of his own community; they held their synods in Rome, but as yet with Greek equality rather than Roman subordination; they were the initiatory College of Cardinals (who still take some of their titles from these sees), but with the Pope as one of this co-equal college, rather

^b Origen visited Rome about the year 211, but his visit was not long; and, with all his fame and learning, to the height of which he had not attained, he was a stranger, without rank or authority. He was not even in orders.

* Calculating from the accession of

Zephyrinus to the Decian persecution. Letter of Pope Cornelius in Euseb. H. E. vi. 42.

^d Each deacon appears to have comprehended under his charitable superintendence two out of the fourteen regions of the city.

than the dominant, certainly not the despotic, head. Of all these suburban districts at this time Portus was the most considerable, and most likely to be occupied by a distinguished prelate. Portus, from the reign of Trajan, had superseded Ostia as the haven of Rome. It was a commercial town of growing extent and opulence, at which most of the strangers from the East who came by sea landed or set sail. Through Portus, no doubt, most of the foreign Christians found their way to Rome.* Of this city at the present time, it can hardly be doubted, Hippolytus was the bishop, Hippolytus who afterwards rose to the dignity of saint and martyr, and whose statue, discovered in the Laurentian cemetery, now stands in the Vatican. Conclusive internal evidence indicates Hippolytus as the author of the Refutation of all Heresies. If any one might dare to confront the Bishop of Rome, it was the Bishop of Portus.

Zephyrinus, according to his unsparing adversary, was an unlearned man; ignorant of the language and definitions of the Church; avaricious, venal, of unsettled principles; not holding the balance between conflicting opinions, but embracing adverse tenets with all the zeal of which a mind so irresolute was capable. He was now a disciple of Cleomenes, the successor of Noetus, and teacher of Noetianism in Rome (Noetus held the extreme Monarchian doctrine, so as to be obnoxious to the charge of Patripassianism), now of Sabellius, who, become more bold, had matured his scheme, which was odious alike to the

Hippolytus.

Pope Zephyrinus.
202-219.

* In the letters of Æneas Sylvius his friends. Dr. Wordsworth has there is a curious account of a visit some interesting details concerning which he made to the site of this Portus, ancient bishopric, then held by one of

other two contending parties. Zephyrinus was entirely governed by the crafty Callistus; and thus constantly driven back, by his fears or confusion of mind, to opposite tenets, and involved in the most glaring contradictions. At one time he publicly used the startling language: "I acknowledge one God, Jesus Christ, and none beside him, that was born and suffered;" at another, he refuted himself, "It was not the Father that died, but the Son." So through the long episcopate of Zephyrinus there was endless conflict and confusion. The author of the Refutation steadily, perseveringly, resisted the vacillating Pontiff, he himself was branded with the opprobrious appellation of Ditheist.

Callistus, who had ruled the feeble mind of Zephyrinus, aspired to be his successor; as head, it should seem, of one of the contending parties, he attained the object of his ambition. The memory of theologic adversaries is tenacious. His enemies were not likely to forget the early life of Callistus, which must have been public and notorious, at least among the Christians. He had been a slave in the family of Carpophorus, a wealthy Christian in the Emperor's household. He was set up by his master in a bank in the quarter called the Piscina Publica. The Christian brethren and widows, on the credit of the name of Carpophorus, deposited their savings in this bank of Callistus. He made away with the funds, was called to account, fled, embarked on board a ship, was pursued, threw himself into the sea—was rescued—brought back to Rome, and ignominiously consigned to hard labour in the public workhouse. The merciful Carpophorus cared not for his own losses, but for those of the poor widows; he released the prisoner on the pretext of collecting monies, which he pretended to be due to him. Callistus

Callistus,
Pope.
213-223.

raised a riot in a Jewish synagogue, was carried before the Prefect Fuscianus, scourged and transported to the mines in Sardinia. On the release of the exiles through the intercession of Marcia, Callistus, though not on the list furnished by the Bishop Victor, persuaded Hyacinthus, the Eunuch appointed to bear the order for the release of the captives to the governor, to become responsible for his liberation also.^f He returned to Rome; the Pope Victor, though distressed by the affair, was too merciful to expose the fraud; Callistus was sent to Antium with a monthly allowance for his maintenance. At Antium (for this release of the Sardinian prisoners must have been at the commencement of Victor's episcopate)^g he remained nine or ten years. Zephyrinus

^f This singular picture of Roman and Christian middle life has an air of minute truthfulness, though possibly somewhat darkened by polemic hostility. Some have supposed that they detect a difference in the style from the rest of the treatise. I perceive none but that which is natural in a transition from polemic or argumentative writing to simple narrative. The suggestion that it is a Novatian interpolation is desperate and preposterous. Novatian was not heard of till thirty years after, his followers, of course, later. What possible motive could they have for blackening the memory of Zephyrinus and Callistus? Novatian was no enemy of the Bishop of Rome; had no design to invalidate his powers. He was the enemy of Cornelius, his successful rival for the see; he aspired himself to be bishop—was, in fact, anti-Pope. The great point on which Novatian made his stand had, indeed, been mooted, but did not

become a cause of fatal division till after the persecution of Decius, the treatment of the Lapsi—those who in the persecution had denied the faith.

Hippolytus, it is true, in the poetic legend of Prudentius (who borrows the circumstances of his martyrdom from the destiny of his namesake in the tragedy of Euripides), is charged with holding the tenets of Novatus, which he recanted, and in his death-agony became a good Catholic. But the author of the *Refutation of all Heresies* can hardly have been involved in the schism of Novatian, who did not appear till so many years after the death of Callistus. Novatian, with such a partisan, would not have sought out three obscure bishops for his ordination. I cannot but think the Spanish legendary poet of the fourth century utterly without historical authority—possibly he confounded different Hippolyti.

^g The release of the prisoners took

recalled him from his obscure retreat; and placed him over the cemetery.^b By degrees the Pope entirely surrendered himself to the guidance of Callistus.

The first act of Callistus on his advancement to the bishopric was the excommunication of Sabellius, an act cordially approved by Hippolytus, and ascribed to the fear of himself. Callistus formed a new scheme, by which he hoped to elude the charge on one side of Patripassianism, on the other of Ditheism. Hippolytus denounces his heresy without scruple or reserve.ⁱ

Christian doctrine, the profound mystery of the Saviour's Godhead, was not the only subject of collision between the adverse parties in the Church of Rome. The difficult reconciliation of Christian tenderness and Christian holiness could hardly fail to produce a milder and more austere party throughout Christendom. The first young influences of Monachism, the perfection claimed by celibacy over the less ostentatious virtue of domestic purity, the notion of the heroism of self-mortification, led to inevitable differences. Montanism, with its fanatic rigour, had wrought up this strife to a great height. The more severe, who did not embrace the Montanist tenets, would not be surpassed by heretics in self-abnegation. The lenity to be shown to penitents, the condescension to the weaknesses of flesh and blood, raised perpetual disputes.

Controversy
on Christian
morals.

place probably in the tenth year of Commodus, the year of Victor's accession, A.D. 190.

^b We are naturally reminded of the cemetery called of Callistus. Avinghi supposes this cemetery older than the time of Callistus.

ⁱ Callistianism differed but slightly

from Noetism. God and His divine Word were one; together they were the Spirit, the one Spiritual Being. This Spirit took flesh of the Virgin; so the Father was in the Son, but he suffered not as the Son, but with the Son.

Callistus throughout, unlike those whose early lives demand indulgence, who are usually the most severe, was himself indulgent to others; and this was the dominant tone at the time in the Roman Church. The author of the Refutation, though uninfected by Montanist tenets, inveighs against the leniency of Callistus, as asserting that even a bishop, guilty of a deadly sin, was not to be deposed. The nature of this, according to Hippolytus, deadly sin, which Callistus treated with such offensive tenderness, appears from the next sentence;^k it related to that grave question which had begun to absorb the Christian mind—the marriage of the clergy. That usage, which has always prevailed, and still prevails, in the Greek Church, as yet seems to have satisfied the more rigorous at Rome. Those who were already married when ordained, retained their wives. But a second marriage, or marriage after ordination, was revolting to the incipient monkery of the Church. But Callistus, according to his implacable adversary, went further, he admitted men who had been twice, even thrice married, to holy orders; he allowed those already in orders to marry. His more indulgent party appealed to the evangelical argument.^m “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant?” They alleged the parables of the tares and wheat, the clean and unclean beasts in the ark. This the more austere denounced as criminal flattery of the passions of the multitude; as the sanction of voluptuousness proscribed by Christ, with the base design of courting popularity,

^k οὗτος ἐδογματίσεν ὅπως εἰ γαμοὶ καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους. Εἰ ἐπίσκοπος ἁμάρτοι τι, εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, μὴ δεῖν κατατίθεσθαι. Ἐπὶ τοῦτου ἤρξαντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι δίγαμοι καὶ τρι-

γαμοὶ καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τις ἐν κλήρῳ ὦν γαμοίη, μένειν τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὅτι μὴ ἡμαρτήκοτα. ix. 12. p. 290.

^m R. H. p. 290.

and swelling the ranks of their faction. There is a heavier charge behind. The widows, if they could not contain, were not only allowed to marry, but to take a slave, or freedman, below their own rank, who could not be their legal husband.^a Hence abortions, and child murders, to conceal these disgraceful connexions. Callistus, therefore, is sanctioning adultery and murder. But even this is not the height of his offence, he had dared to administer a second baptism. So already had ecclesiastical offences become worse in the estimation of vehement religious partisans than moral enormities. Here, at least, it is fair to mistrust the angry adversary. But this conflict between a more indulgent and a more austere party in Rome, and some declaration of the Pope Zephyrinus, probably, rather than Callistus,—but Zephyrinus acting under the influence of Callistus—on the connexion between the sexes, had already excited the indignation of Tertullian in Africa, now still more hardened by his Montanist tenets. “The Bishop of Bishops had promulgated an edict, that he would remit to penitents even the sins of adultery and fornication. This license to lust is issued in the stronghold of all wicked and shameless lusts.”^o

Persecution restored that peace to the Roman Church, which had been so much disturbed throughout her uninvaded prosperity during the tolerant rule of Alexander Severus. In the sudden outburst of hostility, during the short reign of the brutal Thracian, Maximin, Pon-

^a The widows, who had taken on themselves the office of deaconesses, and who, though not bound by vow, were under a kind of virtual engagement against second marriage.

^o De Pudicitia.—Did the title Epi-

scopus Episcoporum, which I think cannot but mean Rome, arise from his superiority to the subbucarian bishops? See, however, on this title the note of Baluzius on the vii. Concil. Carthag.—of in Routh, ii. 153.

tianus, who had followed Urban I., the successor of Callistus, and with him a presbyter, Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile—Sardinia. There Pontianus is said (nor is there much reason to doubt the tradition) to have endured martyrdom. Hippolytus,^p according to the poetic legend in Prudentius of two centuries later, suffered in the suburbs of Rome.^q

The Decian persecution, about thirty years after the death of Callistus, was the birth epoch of Latin Christianity; Cyprian its true parent. Rome, the recognised metropolis of the West, Carthage, the metropolis of the African churches, now are in constant and regular intercourse.^r There is first a Punic league, afterwards at least a threatened Punic war. In the persecution the churches are brought into close alliance by common sympathies, common perils, common sufferings, singularly enough by common schisms; slowly, but no doubt at length, by their common language. The same Imperial edict endangers the life of the Roman and of the Carthaginian Bishop; malcontents from Rome find their way to Carthage, from Carthage to Rome. The same man, Novatus, stirs up rebellion against episcopal authority in Rome and in Carthage; the letters of the churches to each other are promulgated in Latin, though at a period somewhat later those

Decian persecution.

^p Compare Bunsen. The title of Presbyter assigned to Hippolytus, if, as is most probable, the same, with the author of the Refutation and other works, even if he were Bishop of Portus, raises no difficulty. These bishops were members of the Roman Presbytery.

^q At this time, rare likely than

fifteen years afterwards, in the Decian persecution. Legend respects not dates.

^r The intercourse between Carthage and Rome, on account of the corn trade alone, was probably more regular and rapid than in any other part of the empire—mutatis mutandis—like that between Marseilles and Algiers.

from the African churches sent into the East are distinguished from those which came from Rome, as written in the Roman tongue.^a So too in Rome and in Carthage (in Carthage in the most mature and perfect form, from the master mind of Cyprian) appear the Roman strength and the Roman respect for law, the imperious assertion of hierarchical despotism. In the community there is trembling deference for hierarchical authority, though at first with a bold but short resistance. There is an anti-Bishop in Rome and in Carthage. But in both Churches discipline becomes of equal importance with doctrine; the unity of the Church is made to depend on obedience to its outward polity; rebellion to episcopal authority becomes as great a crime as erroneous opinion; schism as hateful as heresy.

Fabianus, under Decius, is the first martyr Bishop of Rome, whose death rests on certain testimony.^b The papal chair remained vacant for a short time; either the Christians dared not choose, or no one dared to assume the perilous rank. Cyprian of Carthage on the same occasion, not from timidity, but from prudent and parental regard for his flock, retired into a safe retreat. There were already divisions in the Church of Carthage. Novatus, a turbulent presbyter, with five others,^c had been jealous of the elevation of Cyprian. Novatus, whose character is darkly drawn by Cyprian, had pre-

^a Euseb., H. E. See above, p. 37, note. the Cav. de Rossi (I have read it myself), see note to Hist. of Christianity, Book II. c. 8.

^b Perhaps that of Pontianus may be above suspicion. (See above.) On the discovery of the name of Fabianus in the real catacomb of Callistus by ^c It is doubtful whether Novatus was one of these five.

sumed to interfere with the bishop's prerogative (a crime hardly less heinous than peculation and lèse-majesté) and himself ordained a deacon, Felicissimus. This hostile party would no doubt heap contempt on the base flight of Cyprian; while they, less in danger, seemed to have remained to brave the persecutor. The party took upon themselves the episcopal functions.* On their own authority, too, the faction of Novatus determined, in the more lenient way, the great reception, the reception of the fallen, those who had denied the faith and offered sacrifice, and those who, with more pardonable weakness, had bought certificates of submission from the venal officers.† Cyprian in vain remonstrated from his retreat: he too had somewhat departed from his old sternness, when he had shut the doors of the Church against the renegades. He was not now for inflexible and peremptory rejection of those weak brethren, for whom he may have learned some sympathy; he insisted only on their less hasty, more formal reception, after penance, confession, imposition of hands by the bishop. Each case was to be separately considered before an assembly of the bishops, presbyters, deacons, the faithful who had stood,‡ and the laity; so popular still was Cyprian's view of episcopal authority. Cornelius, in Rome, had been elected bishop on the

* Cyprian, from his retreat, sent two bishops to collect and administer the alms, probably of great amount, in Carthage. Walch conjectures, with much probability, that Felicissimus may have resented this intrusion on his province as Deacon. On Cyprian compare Hist. of Christianity.

† They were called Libellatici. Compare Mosheim de Reb. Christian.

ante Constant. M., p. 482, 489.

‡ Throughout this is his language—*Viderint laici, hoc quomodo curent.* Ep. liii., also xi. xxix. xxxi. Compare Concil. Carthag. iii., where it is among the objections that a fallen had been received *sine petitu et conscientia plebis*, Mansi sub ann. 252, or Routh, vol. ii. p. 74

return of peace. The same question distracted his Church, but with more disastrous results. The same Novatus was now in Rome: true only to his own restlessness, he here embraced the severer party, at the head of which stood a leader, by some strange coincidence, almost of the same name with his own,

Cornelius
Bishop of
Rome. Novatian.^a This man had been a Stoic philosopher. His hard nature, in the agony of wrestling after truth, before he had found peace in Christianity, broke down both body and mind. His enemies afterwards declared that he had been possessed; the demon was not completely exorcised. He had only received what was called Clinic baptism (an imperfect rite) on what was supposed his death-bed. The Stoic remained within the Christian; he became a rigid ascetic. Novatian sternly declared that no mercy but that of God (from that he did not exclude the fallen) could absolve from the inextinguishable sin of apostacy: the Church, which received such unabsolvable sinners into its bosom, was unclean, and ceased to be the Church. Novatian might have contented himself, like the Thra-seas of old, with protesting against the abuse of episcopal despotism, no less abuse because it erred on the side of leniency. When charged with ambitious designs on the Bishopric of Rome, of having been the rival, and therefore having become the enemy, of Cornelius, he solemnly declared that he preferred the solitary virtue and dignity of the ascetic; it was only by compulsion that he took upon himself the function of an Antipope. Cyprian attributes the schism to the malignant influence

^a The Greek writers all called Novatian, Novatus. We are on historical ground, or what a myth might be made out of these two *Innovators*—Novatus and Novatian.

of Novatus:—"In proportion as Rome is greater than Carthage, so was the sin of Novatus in Rome more heinous than that in Carthage. In Carthage he had ordained a deacon, in Rome he had made a bishop."^b Novatian was publicly but hastily and irregularly consecrated, as Bishop of Rome, by three bishops, it is said, of obscure towns in Italy. Novatian was in doctrine rigidly orthodox; but in Cyprian's view (who makes common cause with the Bishop of Rome against the common enemy) what avails orthodoxy of doctrine in one out of the Church?° He is self-excluded from the pale of salvation. Cyprian had grounds, if not for his abhorrence, for his fears of Novatianism. It aspired itself to be the Church, to set up rival bishops throughout Christendom; the test of that Church was this uncompromising, inflexible severity. Even in Carthage arose another bishop, Fortunatus, who asserted himself to have been consecrated by twenty-three Numidian bishops. Cyprian, not without bitterness, while he admits that Cornelius had rejected his rebellious Deacon Felicissimus from communion, complains that he had been weakly shaken, and induced to waver, by the false representations of the partisans of Fortunatus.^d

^b *Planè quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat illic episcopum fecit.* Epist. xlix. The pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome arises out of the pre-eminent greatness of Rome.

^c *Quod vero ad Novatiani personam pertinet, pater carissime, desiderasti tibi scribi quam hæresin introduxisset, scias nos primo in loco non curiosos esse debere quid ille doceat, cum foris doceat. Quisquis ille est, et qualis-*

cunque est, Christianus non est, qui in Christi ecclesiâ non est. Ad Anton. Epist. lii.

^d Read the whole remarkable letter, lv. ad Cornelium—the strongest revelation of the views, reasonings, passions, fears, hatreds of Cyprian. I cannot consent, with a late writer, to the abandonment of all these documents as spurious. Forgery would not have left the argument so doubtful, or rather so decisive against the object imputed to the forgers.

This transient difference was soon lost in Cyprian's generous admiration for the intrepidity of Cornelius, in whose glorious Confession the whole Church of Rome, even the fallen, who had been admitted as penitents, now nobly joined. Cornelius was banished, it is said, by the Emperor Gallus, to Cività Vecchia; he was followed by vast numbers of believers, who shared his exile and his danger. The Church returned from banishment, but under a new bishop, Lucius; Cornelius had died, the words of Cyprian hardly assert by a violent death.* The Novatians alone, during this new trial of the faith, stood aloof in sullen hostility. They

were too obscure, Cyprian suggests, to provoke the jealousy of the rulers. But Cyprian miscalculated the strength and vitality of Novatianism. It spread throughout Christendom: even in the East, Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, was hardly restrained from joining that party. Dionysius of Alexandria treated their advances with greater wisdom; he earnestly urged Novatian, now that Cornelius was dead and the question laid almost at rest by the cessation of persecution, to return into the bosom of the Church. On Novatian's stubborn refusal, Dionysius condemned in strong terms his harsh Christianity, as depriving the Saviour of his sacred attribute of mercy. But Novatianism endured for above two centuries; it had its bishops in Constantinople, Nicæa, Nicomedia, Citæus in Phrygia, in Cyzicum and Bithynia; even in Alexandria, in Italy, in Gaul, in Spain. It had its saints, its hermits, its monks. St. Ambrose in Italy, Pacianus, Bishop of

* Epist. ad Lucium P. R. reversum ab exilio—lviii. See, however, Epist. lviii.—He is described as martyrio quoque dignatione Domini honoratus. Compare Routh's note, ii. 132.

Barcelona, and towards the end of the fourth century Leo the Great, thought it necessary to condemn or to refute the doctrines of Novatian. The two Byzantine ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and his follower Sozomen, have been accused of leaning to Novatianism.

Novatianism, like all unsuccessful opposition, added strength to its triumphant adversary. It was not so much by its rigour, as by its collision with the Hierarchical system, that it lost its hold on the Christian mind. It declared that there were sins beyond the absolving power of the clergy. By setting up rival bishops in Rome, Carthage, and other cities, it only evoked more commandingly the growing theory of Christian unity, and caused it to be asserted in a still more rigid and exclusive form. Within the pale of the Church, under the lawful Bishop, were Christ and salvation; without it, the realm of the Devil, the world of perdition. The faith of the heretic and schismatic was, no faith, his holiness no holiness, his martyrdom no martyrdom.* Latin Christianity, in the mind of Cyprian, if not its founder, its chief hierophant, had soared to the ideal height of this unity. This Utopia of Cyprian placed St. Peter at the head of the College of co-equal Apostles, from whom the Bishops inherited co-equal

* Compare Walch, *Ketzer-Geschichte*. Walch has collected every passage relating to Novatianism with his usual industry, accuracy, and fairness, ii. pp. 185, 288.

* The second Council of Carthage touches on this absolving power of the priesthood—"Quando permiserit ipse, qui legem dedit ut ligata in terris etiam in cælis ligata essent, solvi autem possent illic quæ hic prius in ecclesiâ

solverentur." The decree of this Council anticipates another instant persecution, and urges, with great force and beauty, the necessity of strengthening all disciples against the coming trial—"quos excitamus et hortamur ad prælium non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione corporis et sanguinis Christi muniamus. Mansi, sub ann. 252, or *Routh, Rel. Sacrae*, v. iii. p. 70.

dignity. The succession of the Bishop of Rome from St. Peter was now, near 200 years after his death, an accredited tradition. Nor, so long as Carthage and Rome were in amity and alliance, did Cyprian scruple to admit (as Carthage could not but own her inferiority to Imperial Rome) a kind of primacy, of dignity at least, in the Metropolitan Bishop.^h

The Punic League suddenly gives place to a Punic War. A new controversy has sprung up in the interval between the Decian and Valerian persecutions, on the rebaptism of heretics. Africa, the East, Alexandria with less decision, declared the baptism by heretics an idle ceremony, and even an impious mimicry of that holy rite, which could only be valid from the consecrated hands of the lawful clergy.

Lucius of Rome had ruled but a few months: he was succeeded by Stephen. This pope^a adopted a milder rule. Every baptism in the name of Christ admitted to Christian privileges. He enforced this rule, according to his adversaries (his own letters are lost), with imperious dictation. At length he broke off communion with all the churches of the East and of Africa, which adhered to the more rigorous practice. But the Eastern hatred of heresy conspired with the hierarchical spirit of Africa, which could endure no intrusion on the prerogatives of the clergy. Cyprian

^a Hoc erant utique et ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis: sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. De unit. Eccles. There is little doubt that this famous passage is an interpolation; it

is not found in the best manuscripts. Yet the whole passage without these words seems to me to bear out the guarded assertion of the text.

^h He denounced Cyprian, according to Firmilian, as a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful workman. Firm. Epist. apud Cyprian. Opera.

confronts Stephen not only as an equal, but, strong in the concurrence of the East and of Alexandria, as his superior. The primacy of Peter has lost its authority. He condemns the perverseness, obstinacy, contumacy of Stephen. He promulgates, in Latin, a letter of Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, still more unmeasured in its censures. Firmilian denounces the audacity, the insolence of Stephen; scoffs at his boasted descent from St. Peter; declares that, by his sin, he has excommunicated himself: he is the schismatic, the apostate from the unity of the Church.* A solemn Council of eighty-seven bishops, assembled at Carthage under Cyprian, asserted the independent judgment of the African Churches, repudiated the assumption of the title, Bishop of Bishops, or the arbitrary dictation of one bishop to Christendom.

Yet even during this internal feud, Latin Christendom was gathering into a separate unity. The Churches of Gaul and Spain appeal at once to Rome and to Carthage; Arles, indeed, in southern Gaul, may still have been Greek. But the high character of Cyprian, and the flourishing state of the African Churches, combined with their Latinity to endow them with this concurrent primacy in the West. Martianus, Bishop of Arles, had embraced Novatianism in all its rigour. The oppressed anti-Novatian party sent to Carthage as well as to

* *Excidisti enim temet ipsum; noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est verè schismaticus, qui se a communione Ecclesiasticæ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Firm. ad Cyprian. I see no ground to question, with some Roman Catholic writers, the authenticity of this letter. No doubt it is a translation from the*

Greek; if by Cyprian himself, it accounts for the sameness of style. A Donatist forgery would have been in a different tone, and directed against different persons. Compare Walch, Ketzer-Geschichte, ii. 323, et seqq. Routh, note B., p. 151.

Rome, to entreat their aid. Cyprian appears to acknowledge the superior right in the Bishop of Rome to appoint a substitute for the rebellious Novatianist. He urges Pope Stephen, by the memory of his martyred predecessors Cornelius and Lucius, not to shrink from this act of necessary rigour.^m This, however, was but a letter from one bishop to another, from Cyprian of Carthage to Stephen of Rome.ⁿ The answer to the Bishops of Spain is the formal act of a synod of African Bishops, assembled under the presidency of the Bishop of Carthage. It is a Latin religious state paper, addressed by one part of Latin Christendom to the rest.^o The Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martialis, of Leon and Astorga, had, during the Decian persecution, denied the faith, offered sacrifice, according to the language of the day, returned to wallow in the mire of paganism. Yet they had dared to resume, not merely their privileges as Christians, but the holy office of bishops. Whatever leniency might be shown to humbler penitents, that the immaculate priesthood should not be irrevocably forfeited by such defilement, revolted not only the more severe, but the general sentiment. Two other bishops, Felix and Sabinus, were consecrated in their place. Basilides found his way to Rome, and imposed by his arts on the unsuspecting Stephen, who commanded his reinstatement in his high office. Appeal was made to Carthage against Rome. Cyprian would strengthen his own authority by that of a synod. At the head of his thirty-five bishops, Cyprian approves the acts of the Presbyters and people of Leon and

^m A.D. 256. Apud Mansi, sub ann.,
 or Routh, Rel. Sac. iii. p. 91.
 Cypriani Epist. lxxvii.

^o The Decrees of the Council of
 Carthage are the earliest Latin *public*
 documents.

Astorga in rejecting such unworthy bishops; treats with a kind of respectful compassion the weakness of Stephen of Rome, who had been so easily abused; and exhorts the Spaniards to adhere to their rightful prelates, Felix and Sabinus.^p

The persecution of Valerian joined the Bishops of Rome and of Carthage, Xystus, the successor of Stephen, and the famous Cyprian, in the same glorious martyrdom.^q

Dionysius, a Calabrian, is again a Greek bishop of Rome, mingling with something of congenial zeal, and in the Greek language, in the controversies of Greek Alexandria, and condemning the errors of the Bishop of the same name, who had the evil report of having been the predecessor of Arius in doctrine. Dionysius, of Alexandria, however, a prelate of great virtue, it should seem, was but incautiously betrayed into these doubtful expressions; at all events, he repudiated the conclusions drawn from his words. With all the more candid and charitable, he soon resumed his fame for orthodoxy. When the Emperor Aurelian^r transferred the ecclesiastical judgment over Paul of Samosata, a rebel against the Empire as against the Church, from the Bishops of Syria to those of Rome and Italy, a subtle Greek heresy, maintained by Syrian Greeks, could not have been adjudicated but by Greeks or by Latins perfect masters of Greek. Dionysius, as Bishop of Rome, passed the first sentence in this important controversy. Felix was Pope in the reign of Aurelian.

A.D. 259.

A.D. 270.

^p Cyprian. Epist. lxvii.

^q On the martyrdom of Cyprian,
Hist. of Christ. ii. 196.

^r Compare, on the act of Aurelianus
Hist. of Christ. ii. p. 202

Towards the close of this third century, throughout the persecution of Diocletian, darkness settles again over the Bishops of Rome. The apostacy of Marcellinus, A.D. 296. Marcellinus is but a late and discarded fable, adopted as favouring the Papal supremacy. Legend assembles three hundred bishops at Sinuessa, three hundred Bishops peaceably debating at such times in a small Neapolitan town! This synod refused to take notice of the crime of St. Peter's successor. Marcellinus was forced to degrade himself.

The legend, that his successor, Marcellus, was reduced to the servile office of a groom, rests on no better authority. Marcellus, A.D. 304. Had it any claim to truth, the successors of Marcellus had full and ample revenge, when kings and emperors submitted to the same menial service, and held the stirrup for the Popes to mount their horses.

CHAPTER II.

Rome after the Conversion of Constantine.

Thus, down to the conversion of Constantine, the biography of the Roman Bishops, and the history of the Roman Episcopate, are one; the acts and peculiar character of the Pontiffs, the influence and fortunes of the See, excepting in the doubtful and occasional gleams of day which have brought out Victor, Zephyrinus, Callistus, Cornelius, Stephen, into more distinct personality, are involved in a dim and vague twilight. On the establishment of Christianity, as the religion if not of the Empire, of the Emperor, the Bishop of Rome rises at once to the rank of a great accredited functionary; the Bishops gradually, though still slowly, assume the life of individual character. The Bishop is the first Christian in the first city of the world, and that city is legally Christian. The Supreme Pontificate of heathenism might still linger from ancient usage among the numerous titles of the Emperor; but so long as Constantine was in Rome, the Bishop of Rome, the head of the Emperor's religion, became in public estimation the equal, in authority and influence immeasurably the superior, to all of sacerdotal rank. The schisms and factions of Christianity now become affairs of state. As long as Rome is the imperial residence, an appeal to the Emperor is an appeal to the Bishop of Rome. The Bishop of Rome sits, by the imperial authority, at the head of a

synod of Italian prelates, to judge the disputes with the African Donatists.

Melchiades held the See of Rome at the time of

Melchiades.
A.D. 312-314.
Jan. 31.
Silvester.

Constantine's conversion, but soon made room for Silvester, whose name is more inseparably connected with that great event. Silvester has become a kind of hero of religious fable. But it was not so much the genuine mythical spirit which unconsciously transmutes history into legend; it was rather deliberate invention, with a specific aim and design, which, in direct defiance of history, accelerated the baptism of Constantine, and sanctified a porphyry vessel as appropriated to, or connected with, that holy use: and at a later period produced the monstrous fable of the Donation.*

Melchiades,
Silvester.
A.D. 312-314.
Jan. 31.

But that with which Constantine actually did invest

* This document—the Imperial Edict of Donation—a forgery as clumsy as audacious, ought to be inspected by those who would judge of the ignorance which could impose, or the credulity which would receive it, as the title-deed to enormous rights and possessions. (Muratori ascribes the forgery of the act to the period between 755 and 766.)—*Palatium nostrum . . . et urbem Romam, et totius Italæ, et occidentalium regionum provincias, loca, civitates . . . prædicto beatissimo patri nostro Silvestro Catholico Papæ tradentes et cedentes hujus et successoribus, ejus Pontificatus potestate . . . divino nostro hoc pragmatico decreto administrari diffinimus, juri sanctæ Romanorum ecclesiæ subiacenda et in eo permansura exhibemus.*

The Donation may be found, prefixed to Laurentius Valla's famous refutation. Read, too, the more guarded and reluctant surrender of Nicholas of Cusa, the feeble murmur of defence from Antoninus, archbishop—*apud Brown, Fasciculus, p. 124, 161.* Before the Reformation, the Donation had fallen the first victim of awakening religious inquiry. Dante, while he denounces, does not venture to question the truth of Constantine's gift. By the time of Ariosto it had become the object of unrebuked satire, even in Italy. Astolpho finds it among the chimeras of earth in the moon,

“or puzza forte.
Questo era il don (se però dir lice)
Che Constantino al buon Silvestro fece.”
Orl. Fur. xxxiv. 80

the Church, the right of holding landed property, and receiving it by bequest, was far more valuable to the Christian Hierarchy, and not least to the Bishop of Rome, than a premature and prodigal endowment, which would at once have plunged them in civil affairs; and, before they had attained their strength, made them objects of jealousy or of rapacity to the temporal Sovereign. Had it been possible, a precipitate seizure, or a hasty acceptance of large territorial possessions would have been fatal to the dominion of the Church. It was the slow and imperceptible accumulation of wealth, the unmarked ascent to power and sovereignty, which enabled the Papacy to endure for centuries.

The obscurity of the Bishops of Rome was not in this alone their strength. The earlier Pontiffs (Clement is hardly an exception) were men, who of themselves commanded no great authority, and awoke no jealousy. Rome had no Origen, no Athanasius, no Ambrose, no Augustine, no Jerome. The power of the Hierarchy was established by other master minds: by the Carthaginian Cyprian, by the Italian Ambrose, the Prelate of political weight as well as of austere piety, by the eloquent Chrysostom.^b The names of none of the Popes, down to Leo and Gregory the Great, appear among the distinguished writers of Christendom.^c This more cautious and retired dignity was no less favourable to their earlier power, than to their later claim of infallibility. If more stirring and

Roman
Bishops
obscure.

^b Chrysostom's book on the Priesthood throughout.

^c Early Christianity, it may be observed, cannot be justly estimated from its writers. The Greeks were

mostly trained in the schools of philosophy—the Latin in the schools of rhetoric: and polemic treatises could not but form a great part of the earliest Christian literature.

ambitious men, they might have betrayed to the civil power the secret of their aspiring hopes; if they had been voluminous writers, in the more speculative times, before the Christian creed had assumed its definite and coherent form, it might have been more difficult to assert their unimpeachable orthodoxy.

The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople consummated the separation of Greek and Latin Christianity; one took the dominion of the East, the other of the West. Greek Christianity has now another centre in the new capital; and the new capital has entered into those close relations with the great cities of the East, which had before belonged exclusively to Rome. Alexandria has become the granary of Constantinople; her Christianity and her commerce, instead of floating along the Mediterranean to Italy, pours up the *Ægean* to the city on the *Bosphorus*. The Syrian capitals, Antioch, Jerusalem, the cities of Asia Minor and Bithynia, Ephesus, Nicæa, Nicomedia, own another mistress. The tide of Greek trade has ebbed away from the West, and found a nearer mart; political and religious ambition and adventure crowd to the new Eastern Court. That Court becomes the chosen scene of Christian controversy; the Emperor is the proselyte to gain whom contending parties employ argument, influence, intrigue.

That which was begun by the foundation of Constantinople, was completed by the partition of the empire between the sons of Constantine. There are now two Roman worlds, a Greek, and a Latin. In one respect, Rome lost in dignity: she was no longer the sole Metropolis of the empire; the East no longer treated her with the deference of a subject. On the other hand, she was the uncontested, unrivalled

head of her own hemisphere; she had no rival in those provinces, which yet held her allegiance, either as to civil or religious supremacy. The separation of the empire was not more complete between the sons of Constantine or Theodosius, than between Greek and Latin Christianity.

In Rome itself Latin Christianity had long been in the ascendant. Greek had slowly and imperceptibly withdrawn from her services, her ^{Latin Christianity that of Rome.} Scriptures, her controversial writings, the spirit of her Christianity. It is now in the person of Athanasius, a stranger hospitably welcomed, not a member at once received into her community. Great part of the three years, during which Athanasius resided in Rome, must be devoted to learning Latin, before he can obtain his full mastery over the mind of the Roman Pontiff, perhaps, before he can fully initiate the Romans in the subtle distinctions of that great controversy.^d

The whole West, Africa, Gaul, in which so soon as the religion spread beyond the Greek settlements, it found Latin, if not the vernacular, ^{Of the West.} the dominant language (the native Celtic had been driven back into obscurity), Spain, what remained of Britain, formed a religious as well as a civil realm. In her Apostolical antiquity, in the dignity therefore of her Church, Rome stood as much alone and unapproachable among the young and undistinguished cities of the West, as in her civil majesty. After Cyprian, Carthage, until the days of Augustine, had sunk back into her secondary rank: Africa had been long rent to pieces by the Donatist schisms. Rome, therefore, might gather up her strength in quiet, before she com-

mitted herself in strife with any of her more formidable adversaries ; and those adversaries were still weakening each other in the turmoils of unending controversy ; so as to leave the almost undivided Unity of the West, an object of admiration and envy to the rest of Christendom.

For throughout the religious and civil wars, which almost simultaneously with the conversion of ^{Trinitarian controversy.} Constantine distracted the Christian world, ~~the~~ Bishops of Rome and of the West stood aloof in unimpassioned equanimity ; they were drawn into the Trinitarian controversy, rather than embarked in it by their own ardent zeal. So long as Greek Christianity predominated in Rome, so long had the Church been divided by Greek doctrinal controversy. There the earliest disputes about the divinity of the Saviour had found ready audience. But Latin Christianity, as it grew to predominance in Rome, seemed to shrink from these foreign questions, or rather to abandon them for others more congenial. The Quarto Deciman controversy related to the establishment of a common law of Christendom, as to the time of keeping her great Festival. So in Novatianism, the re-admission of apostates into the outward privileges of the Church, the kindred dispute concerning the re-baptism of heretics, were constitutional points, which related to the ecclesiastical polity. Donatism turned on the legitimate succession of the African Bishops.

The Trinitarian controversy was an Eastern question. It began in Alexandria, invaded the Syrian cities, was ready, from its foundation, to disturb the churches, and people the streets of Constantinople with contending factions. Until taken up by the fierce and busy heterodoxy of Constantius when sole Emperor, it chiefly

agitated the East. The Asiatic Nicæa was the seat of the Council; all but a very few of the three hundred and twenty Bishops, who formed the Council, were from Asiatic or Egyptian sees. There were two Presbyters only to represent the Bishop of Rome; the Bishop by his absence happily escaped the dangerous precedent, which might have been raised by his appearance in any rank inferior to the Presidency. Besides these Presbyters, there were not above seven or eight Western Prelates. Hosius of Cordova, if, as some accounts state, he presided, did so as the favourite of the Emperor; if it may be so expressed, as the Court divine.[†]

During the second period of the Trinitarian controversy, when the Arian Emperor of the East, Constantius, had made it a question which
Second Period.
 involved the whole world in strife; and, though it was not the cause of the fratricidal war between the sons of Constantine, yet no doubt it aggravated the hostility; Rome alone, except for a short time of compulsory submission, remained faithful to the cause of Athanasius. The great Athanasius himself, a second time an exile from the East,[‡] the object of the Eastern Em-

* τῆς δὲ γε βασιλευούσης πόλεως ὁ μὲν πρόεδρος διὰ γῆρας ὑστέροι· πρεσβύτεροι δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντες τὴν αὐτοῦ τάξιν ἐπλήρωσαν. The expression "the royal city" is significant. Socrat. H. E., i. 8. The presbyters' names are reported, Vitus and Vincentius.

† Hosius is named by writers of the fifth century as the first among the bishops at Nicæa to sign the decrees. Gelas. Cyzicen. Act. Concil. sub ann.

325.) Theodoret assigns a kind of presidency to Eustathius of Antioch. In all the earlier accounts it is impossible to discern any president, certainly none when the emperor is present. Hosius, in later times, was taken up as the representative of the Bishop of Rome. Compare Schröckh. C. K. v. p. 335.

‡ On his first exile he had been received by the Emperor Constantine at Treves.

~~and~~ inveterate animosity, had found a hospitable reception at Rome. There, having acquired the knowledge of Latin, he laid the spell of his master-mind on the Pope Julius, and received the deferential homage of Latin Christianity, which accepted the creed, which its narrow and barren vocabulary could hardly express in adequate terms. Yet throughout, the adhesion of Rome and of the West was a passive acquiescence in the dogmatic system, which had been wrought out by the profounder theology of the Eastern divines, rather than a vigorous and original examination on her part of those mysteries. The Latin Church was the scholar, as well as the loyal partisan of Athanasius. New and unexpected power grew out of this firmness in the head of Latin Christianity, when so large a part of Eastern Christendom had fallen away into what was deemed apostasy. The orthodoxy of the West stood out in bold relief at the Council of Sardica.^h

At this council, held under the protection, and within the realm of the orthodox Constans, the occupation of all the greater sees in the East by Arian or semi-Arian prelates, the secession of the Eastern mi-

^h Even those Latin writers (for Latin Christianity could not altogether be silent on the controversy) who treated on the Trinity, rather set forth or explained to their flocks the orthodox doctrines determined in the East, than refuted native heresies, or proposed their own irrefragable judgment. Nor were the more important treatises written in the capital, or in the less barbarised Latin of Rome, but by Hilary, the Gallic bishop of Poitiers, in the rude and harsh Roman dialect of the province; and Hilary had been banished to the East, where he had become impregnated with the spirit, to his praise be it said, by no means with the acrimony of the stuff. At the close of the controversy a Latin creed embodied the doctrines of Athanasius and of the anti-Nestorian writers; but even this was not so much a work of controversy, as a final summary of Latin Christianity, as to the ultimate result of the whole. It is the creed commonly called that of St. Athanasius.

nority from the council, left Latin Christianity, as it were, the representative of Christendom. It assumed to itself the dignity and authority of a General Council, and it might seem that the suffrage of that Council awed the reluctant Constantius, and enforced the restoration of Athanasius to his see. By some happy fortune, by some policy prescient of future advantage, it might be unwillingness to risk his dignity at so great a distance from his own city, the trouble or expense of long journeys, or more important avocations at home, or the uncertainty that he would be allowed the place of honour, the Bishop of Rome (Julius I.) was absent from Sardica as from Nicæa. Hosius of Cordova again presided in that assembly. A.D. 347.
Council of Sardica. Three Italian bishops appended their signatures after that of Hosius, as representing the Roman Pontiff. Unconsciously the representatives of these times prepared the way for the Legates of future ages. Western Christendom might seem disposed to show its gratitude to Rome for its pure and consistent orthodoxy, by acknowledging at Sardica a certain right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome from Illyricum and Macedonia. These provinces were still part of the empire of the West, and the decree might seem as if the Primacy of Rome was to be co-extensive with the Western Empire. The metropolitan power of Latin Christianity thus gathered two large provinces, mostly Greek in race and in language, under its jurisdiction. The bishops of Illyricum and Macedonia, in seeking a temporary protector (no doubt their immediate object) from the lawless tyranny of their Eastern and heterodox superiors, foresaw not that they were imposing on themselves a master who would never relax his claim to their implicit obedience.

Liberius, the successor of Julius I., had to endure
Pope Libe- the fiercer period of conflict with the Arian
rius. A.D. 352, May 22. **Emperor. Constantius was now sole master of**
the Roman world. From the councils of Arles and of
Council of Milan had been extorted by bribes, by threats,
Arles, and by force, the condemnation of Athana-
A.D. 355. **sus. Liberius had commenced his pontificate**
Council of Milan. **with an act of declared hostility to Athana-**
A.D. 355. **sus. He had summoned the Prelate of Alexandria to**
Rome: he had declared him cut off from the com-
munion of the West.¹ But if, from fear of Constantius,
he had rejected Athanasius, he soon threw off his
timidity: he as suddenly changed his policy as his
opinions. He disclaimed his feeble Legate, the Bishop
of Capua, who in his name had subscribed at Arles the
sentence against the great Trinitarian. Himself, at
length, after suffering menace, persecution, exile, was
reduced so far to compromise his principles as to assent
to that condemnation. Yet nothing could show more
strongly the different place now occupied by the Bishop
of Rome, in the estimation of Rome and of the world.
Liberius is no martyr, calmly laying down his life for
Christianity, inflexibly refusing to sacrifice on an hea-
then altar. He is a prelate, rejecting the summary
commands of a heretical sovereign, treating his mes-
sages, his blandishments, his presents, with lofty dis-
dain. The Arian Emperor of the world discerns the
importance of attaching the Bishop of Rome to his
party, in his mortal strife with Athanasius. His chief
minister, the Eunuch Eusebius, appears in Rome to
negotiate the alliance, bears with him rich presents, and

¹ Liberii Epistol. apud Hilar. Fragm. v.

a letter from the Emperor.^k Liberius coldly answers that the Church of Rome, having solemnly declared Athanasius guiltless, he could not condemn him. A.D. 356. Nothing less than a Council of the Church, from which the Emperor, his officers, and all the Arian prelates shall be excluded, can reverse the decree. Eusebius threatens, but in vain; he lays down the Emperor's gifts in the Church of St. Peter. Liberius orders the infected offerings to be cast out of the sanctuary. He proceeds to utter a solemn anathema against all Arian heretics. Thus Roman liberty has found a new champion. The Bishop stands on what he holds to be the law of the Church; he is faithful to the Prelate, whose creed has been recognised as exclusive Christian truth by the Senate of Christendom. He disfranchises all, even the Emperor himself, from the privileges of the Christian polity. Constantius, in his wrath, orders the seizure of his rebellious subject; but the Bishop of Rome is no longer at the head of a feeble community: he is respected, beloved by the whole city. All Rome is in commotion in defence of the Christian prelate. The city must be surrounded, and even then it is thought more prudent to apprehend Liberius by night, and to convey him secretly out of the city. He is sent to the Emperor at Milan. Liberius at Milan. He appears before Constantius, with the aged Hosius of Cordova, and all the more distinguished orthodox prelates of the West, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilary of Poitiers. He maintains the same lofty tone. Constantius declares that Athanasius has been condemned by a Council of the Church;

^k Athanas. Hist. Arian. Ad Monach. ii. c. 15, 16. Sozomen, iv. c. 11. p. 764, et seqq. Theodoret, H. E. Ammian. Marcell. xv. c. 7.

he insists on the treason of Athanasius in corresponding with the enemies of the Emperor. Liberius is unshaken: "If he were the only friend of Athanasius, he would adhere to the righteous cause." The Bishop of Rome is banished to cold and inhospitable Thrace. He scornfully rejects offers of money, made by the Emperor for his expenses on the way. "Let him keep it to pay his soldiers." To the eunuch who made the like offer, he spoke with more bitter sarcasm. "Do you, who have wasted all the churches of the world, presume to offer me alms as a criminal? Away, first become a Christian!"^m

Two years of exile in that barbarous region, the dread of worse than exile, perhaps disastrous news from Rome, at length broke the spirit of Liberius; he consented to sign the semi-Arian creed of Sirmium, and to renounce the communion of Athanasius.ⁿ

For the Emperor had attempted to strike a still heavier blow against the rebellious exile. A rival bishop, as though the See were vacant, had usurped the throne. Felix was elected, it was said, by three eunuchs, who presumed to represent the people of Rome, and consecrated by three courtly prelates, two of them from the East. But the Clergy of Rome, and the people with still more determinate resolution, kept aloof from the empty churches, where Bishop Felix, if not himself an Arian, did not scruple to communicate with Arians.^o The estrangement con-

^m Athanas. Apolog. Contra Arian. Lalila which robbed the Episcopal p. 205. Ad Monach. p. 368. Theodoret, ii. c. 16, 17. Samsou (Liberius) of his strength and fortitude.

ⁿ The jealousy of Felix, according to Baronius (sub ann. 357), was the
^o Theodoret (H. E. ii. 16) and Sozomen (H. E. iv. 15) plainly assert

tinued through the two years of the exile of Liberius; the Pastor was without a flock. At the close of this period, the Emperor Constantius visited A.D. 357. Rome; the females, those especially of the upper rank (history now speaks as if the whole higher orders were Christians), had most strenuously maintained the right of Liberius, and refused all allegiance to the intrusive Felix. They endeavoured to persuade the Senators, Consulars, and Patricians, to make a representation to the Emperor; the timid nobles devolved the dangerous office on their wives. The female deputation, in their richest attire as befitting their rank, marched along the admiring streets, and stood before the Imperial presence; by their fearless pertinacity they obtained a promise for the release of Liberius. Even then Constantius was but imperfectly informed concerning the strength of the factions which himself having exasperated to the utmost, he now vainly attempted to reconcile. His Edict declared that the two Bishops should rule with conjoint authority, each over his respective community. Such an edict of toleration was premature by nearly fourteen

that Felix adhered to the creed of Nicæa. Socrates (H. E. ii. 37) condemns him as infected by the Arian heresy. By Athanasius (ad Monach., p. 861) he is called a monster, raised by the malice of Antichrist, worthy of, and fit to execute, the worst designs of his wicked partisans. This prelate of questionable faith, this usurper of the Roman See, has stolen, it is difficult to conjecture how, into the Roman Martyrology. It seems clear that he retired from Rome, and died a few years after in peace. Gregory the Thirteenth, when searching investiga-

tions into ecclesiastical history became necessary, startled by the perplexing difficulty, perhaps of a canonized Arian, certainly of an antipope with the honours of a martyr, ordered a regular inquiry into the claims of Felix. (Baron. Ann. sub ann. 357.) The case looked desperate for the memory of Felix; he was in danger of degradation, when, by a seasonable miracle, his body was discovered with an ancient inscription, "Pope and Martyr." Baronius wrote a book about it, which was never published.

centuries or more. In that place, the uncongenial atmosphere of which we should hardly have expected Christian passions to have penetrated, the Circus of Rome, the Edict was publicly read. "What!" exclaimed the scoffing spectators, "because we have two factions here, distinguished by their colours, are we to have two factions in the Church?" The whole audience broke forth in an overwhelming shout, "One God! one Christ! one Bishop!"

Liberius returned, in the course of the next year, to Rome. His entrance was an ovation; the people thronged forth, as of old to meet some triumphant Consul, or Cicero on his return from exile. The rival bishop, Felix, fled before his face;^p but Felix and his party would not altogether abandon the co-equal dignity assigned him by the decree of Constantius, and confirmed by the Council of Sirmium. He returned; and, at the head of a body of faithful ecclesiastics, celebrated divine worship in the basilica of Julius, beyond the Tiber. He was expelled, patricians and populace uniting against this, one of the earliest Antipopes who resisted armed force.^q A tradition has survived in the Pontifical Annals, of a proscription, a massacre.^r The streets, the baths, the churches ran with blood,—the streets, where the partisans of rival bishops encountered in arms: the baths, where Arian and Catholic could not wash together

^p Hieron. Chron. Marc. et Faust. p. 4.

^q This curious passage in the Pontifical Annals (apud Muratori iii. sub ann.) is evidently from the party of Felix;—it asserts his Catholicity.

^r Gibbon (who for once does not quote his special authority, nevertheless accepts it), c. xxi. v. iii. p. 385. It is rejected by Bower (v. i. p. 141) and by Walch, 'Lives of Popes,' *in loc.*

without mutual contamination; the churches where they could not join in common worship to the same Redeemer. Felix himself escaped; and lived some years in peace, on an estate near the road to Portus.* Liberius, Rome itself, sinks back into obscurity; the Pope mingled not, as far as is known, in the fray, which had now involved the West as well as the East, Latin as well as Greek Christianity; A.D. 359. he was absent from the fatal Council of Rimini,† which deluded the world into unsuspected Arianism.‡

The Emperor Julian, during his short and eventful reign, might seem to have forgotten that there was such a city as Rome. Paris, Athens, A.D. 361-363 Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, perhaps Alexandria, might seem to be the only Imperial cities Julian worthy of his regard. It was a Greek religion Emperor. which he aspired to restore; his philosophy was Greek; his writings Greek; he taught, ruled, worshipped, perished in the East.* Under his successors (after Jovian), Valentinian, and Valens, while Valens Valentinian. afflicted the East by his feeble and frantic Sept. 23 or 24, 366. zeal for Arianism, Valentinian maintained the repose of the West by his rigid and impartial toleration.‡

On the death of Liberius, the factions, which had smouldered in secret, broke out again with fatal fury. The Pontificate of Damasus displays Christianity now not merely the dominant, it might almost seem the

* He died the year before Liberius, 365.

† Hist. of Christ. ii. p. 445.

‡ Liberius had already subscribed, during his banishment, the creed of Sirmium. Constantius and his semi-Arian or Arian counsellors may have

been content with that act of submission, which had not been formally revoked.

* On Julian, Hist. of Christ. Book iii. c. vi.

‡ Compare Hist. of Christ. iii. p. 52.

sole religion of Rome; and the Roman character is working as visibly into Christianity. The election to the Christian bishopric arrays the people in adverse factions; the government is appalled; churches become citadels, are obstinately defended, furiously stormed; they are defiled with blood. Men fall in murderous warfare before the altar of the Prince of Peace. In one sense it might seem the reanimation of Rome to new life; ancient Rome is resuming her wonted but long-lost liberties. The iron hand of despotism, from the time of the last Triumvirate, or rather from the accession of Augustus to the Empire, had compressed the unruly populace, which only occasionally dared to break out, on a change in the Imperial dynasty, to oppose, or be the victims of, the Prætorian soldiery. Now, however, the Roman populace appears quickened by a new principle of freedom; of freedom, if with some of its bold independence, with all its blind partisanship, its headstrong and stubborn ferocity. The great offices, which still perpetuated in name the ancient Republic, the Senatorship, Quæstorship, Consulate, are quietly transmitted according to the Imperial mandates, excite no popular commotion, nor even interest; for they are honorary titles, which confer neither influence, nor authority, nor wealth. Even the Prefecture of the city is accepted at the will of the Emperor, who rarely condescends to visit Rome. But the election to the bishopric is now not merely an affair of importance—the affair of paramount importance it might seem,—in Rome; it is an event in the annals of the world. The heathen historian,* on whose notice had already been

* I assume, without hesitation, the heathenism of Ammianus, though with regard to him, as to other writers of the time, there is as much truth as sagacity in the observation of Heyne —Est obvia res in lectione scriptorum

forced the Athanasian controversy, Athanasius himself, and the acts and the exile of Liberius, assigns the same place to the contested promotion of Damasus which Livy might to that of one of the great consuls, tribunes, or dictators. He interprets, as well as relates, the event:—"No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the Bishopric of Rome, men should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table—these are the rewards of successful ambition."^b The honest historian contrasts this pomp and luxury with the abstemiousness, the humility, the exemplary gentleness of the provincial prelates. Ammianus, ignorant or regardless as to the legitimacy of either election, arraigns both Damasus and his rival Ursicinus^c as equally guilty

istius temporis, prudentium ple-
nosque nec patrias religiones aljecisse,
nec novas damnasse, sed in his quoque
pro suorum ingeniorum facultate pro-
banda probasse. Heynii Probus, in
Wagneri edit. p. cxcv.

^a Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 3,
sub ann. 367.

^b Compare—it is amusing and in-
structive—the Cardinal Baronius
writing in the splendid Papal court,
and the severe Jansenist Tillemont, on
this passage.

^c On the side of Ursicinus (Ursinus)
is the remarkable document published
by Sirmond (Opera, i. p. 127), the
petition of Marcellinus and Faustinus
to the Emperor Theodosius, who, in

his answer, though they were after-
wards Luciferians (an unpopular sect),
testifies to their character by his
gracious promises of protection. Ac-
cording to the Preface (is it quite
certain that the Preface is of the same
date?) to this Libellus Precum, Da-
masus was supported by the party of
Felix, he was the successor of Felix,
the reputed Arian, Ursicinus of Libe-
rius^{*} The Presbyters, Deacons, and
faithful people, who had adhered to
Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian
Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus
who was consecrated by Paul, bishop
of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed
by the followers of Felix, in S. M.
Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of

^{*} Damasus, from other authority, is said to have sworn as Presbyter to own no bishop
but Liberius, to have accompanied him in exile, but speedily deserted him, returned to
Rome, and at last submitted to Felix.

authors of the tumult. Of the Christian writers (and there are, singularly enough, contemporary witnesses, probably eye-witnesses, on each side), the one asserts the priority and legality of election in favour of Damasus, the other of Ursicinus; the one aggravates, the other extenuates the violence and slaughter. But that scenes occurred of frightful atrocity is beyond all doubt. So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the Præfect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighbourhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the basilica of Sisinnius. The triumph of Damasus cannot relieve his memory from the sanction, the excitement of, hardly

charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome. Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven Presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to the Lateran: their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of Liberius (S. Maria Maggiore). Damasus, at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and labourers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church: a hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus were obliged to withdraw,

vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections. Ursicinus returned from exile more than once, but Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favour; and the council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at length to give up the contest.

On the other hand Damasus had on his side the great vindicator—success. Rufinus and Jerome (then at Rome, afterwards the secretary of Damasus) assert, with the same minuteness and particularity, the priority and the lawfulness of his election: they treat Ursicinus as a schismatic; but they cannot deny, however they may mitigate, the acts of violence and bloodshed.

from active participation in, these deeds of blood.⁴ Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus; he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the church of St. Agnes. The Emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Prætextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see.

The strife between Damasus and Ursicinus was a prolongation or revival of that between Libe-
rius and Felix, and so may have remotely ^{Damasus Pope.} grown out of the doctrinal conflict of Arianism and Trinitarianism.⁵ No doubt too it was a conflict of personal ambition, for the high prize of the Roman Episcopate. But there was another powerful element of discord among the Christians of Rome. The heathen historian saw and described the outward aspect of things, the tumults which disturbed the peace of the city, the conflagrations, the massacres, the assaulted and defended churches, the two masses of believers striving in arms for the mastery. So too he saw the more notorious habits, the public demeanour of the bishops and of the clergy, their pomp, wealth, ceremony.

⁴ Baronius ingeniously discovered a certain Maximus, a man of notorious cruelty, who afterwards held a high office, and might, perhaps, have been accessory to the late scenes of tumult; and so quietly exculpates Damasus, by laying all the carnage upon Maximus, who was not in authority, possibly not in Rome at the commencement of the strife.

⁵ Jerome, Epist. xv. t. i. p. 39, asserts the orthodoxy of Damasus, the Arianism of Ursicinus: but Jerome is hardly conclusive authority against the enemy of Damasus. See S. Basil Ep. 266, for an unfavourable character of Damasus.

The letters of Jerome, while they confirm the statements of Ammianus, reveal the internal state, the more secret workings, in this new condition of society. Athanasius had not merely brought with him into the West the more speculative controversies which distracted Greek Christianity, he had also introduced the principles and spirit of Eastern Monasticism: and this too had been embraced with all the strength and intensity of the Roman character. That which during the whole of the Roman history had given a majesty, a commanding grandeur to the virtues and to the vices of the Romans, to their patrician pride and plebeian liberty, to their frugality and rapacity, to their courage, discipline, and respect for order; to their prodigality, luxury, sensuality; to their despotism and their servility; now seemed to survive in the force and devotion with which they threw themselves into Christianity, and into Christianity in its most extreme, if it may be so said, excessive form. On the one hand the Bishop and the clergy are already aspiring to a sacerdotal power and pre-eminence hardly attained, hardly aimed at, in any other part of Christendom; the Pontiff cannot rest below a magnificence which would contrast as strongly with the life of the primitive Bishop, as that of Lucullus with that of Fabricius. The prodigality of the offerings to the church and to the clergy, those more especially by bequest, is so immoderate, that a law^f is necessary to restrain the profuseness on one hand, the avidity on the other, a law which the statesman Ambrose^g and the Monk Jerome approve,

Monasticism
in Rome.

Law against
Heresy.

^f The law of Valentinian (A.D. 370), | churches of the city. Cod. Theodos addressed to Damasus, bish. p of Rome, xiv. 2, 20.
and ordered to be read in all the ^g Ambros. Epist. xlii. l. 5, p. 200

as demanded by the abuses of the times. "Priests of idols, mimes, charioteers, harlots may receive bequests; it is interdicted, and wisely interdicted, only to ecclesiastics and monks." The Church may already seem to have taken the place of the Emperor as universal legatee. As men before bought by this posthumous adulation the favour of Cæsar, so would they now that of God. Heredipety, or legacy hunting, is inveighed against, in the clergy especially, as by the older Satirists. Jerome in his epistles is the Juvenal of his times, without his grossness indeed, for Christianity no doubt had greatly raised the standard of morals. The heathen, as represented by such men as Prætextatus (they now seem to have retired into a separate community, and stood in relation to the general society, as the Christians had stood to the heathen under Vespasian or the Antonines), had partaken in the moral advancement. But with this great exception, this repulsive licence, Jerome, both in the vehemence of his denunciations, and in his description of the vices, manners, habits of Rome, might seem to be writing of pre-Christian times.^h

Hieronym. Epist. ii. p. 13. Solis clericis et monachis hæc lege prohibetur, et prohibetur non a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis. Nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem.—Hieronym. ad Nepotian.

^h Prudentius, with poetic anachronism, throws back the jealousy of the heathens of the enormous wealth offered on the altars of the Christians, and the alienation of estates from their right heirs, into the third century. The Prefect of Rome reproaches the Deacon

Laurentius, before his martyrdom (about 258), with the silver cups and golden candlesticks of the service :—

"Tum summa cura est fratribus—Ut sermo testatur loquax,
Offerre, fundis venditis—Sestertiorum millia,
Addicta avorum prædia—Fœdis sub auctionibus,
Successor exhaeres gemit—Sanctis egens parentibus
Hæc occulantur abditis—Ecclesiarum in angulis,
Et summa pietas creditur—Nudare^u dulces liberos."—*Peristeph Hymn* 11.

Compare Paolo Sarpi delle Materie Beneficarie, c. vi. v. iv. p. 74.

But the Roman character did not interwork into the general Christianity alone, it embraced monastic Christianity, in all its extremest rigour; its sternest asceticism, with the same ardour and energy. Christian Stoicism could not but find its Catos; but it was principally among the females that the recoil seemed to take place from the utter shamelessness, the unspeakable profligacy of the Imperial times, to a severity of chastity, to a fanatic appreciation of virginity as an angelic state, as a kind of religious aristocratical distinction far above the regular virtues of the wife or the matron. Pope Damasus, though by no means indifferent to the splendour of his office, was the patron, as his secretary Jerome was the preacher, of this powerful party; and between this party and the priesthood of Rome there was already that hostility which has so constantly prevailed between the Regulars, the observants of monastic rule, and what were called in later times the secular clergy. The Monastics inveighed against the worldly riches, pomp, and luxury of the clergy: the clergy looked with undisguised jealousy on the growing, irresistible influence of the monks, especially over the high born females.¹ Jerome hated,

¹ Jerome spared neither the clergy nor the monks. On the clergy, see the passage (ad Eustochium): *Sunt alii, de hominibus loquor, mei ordinis, qui ideo presbyteratum et diaconatum ambiunt ut mulieres licentius videantur.* Then follows the description of a clerical coxcomb. His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed; that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is curled with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic. Jerome ends the passage. *Et isti sunt sacerdotes Baal.* Then on the monks (ad Nepot.): *Nonnulli sunt ditiores monachi, quam fuerant sæculares et clerici, qui possident opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete et fallaci Diabolo non habuerant, et seqq.* Compare, throughout, the account of Jerome, in the *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 225, *et seqq.*

and was hated with the most cordial reciprocity. The austere Jerome was accused, unjustly no doubt, of more than spiritual intimacy with his distinguished converts; his enemies brought a charge of adultery against Pope Damasus himself.^k

Nor was this a question merely between the superior clergy and a man in the high and invidious position of Jerome, renowned for his boundless learning, and holding the eminent office of secretary under Pope Damasus. It was a dispute which agitated the people of Rome. Among the female proselytes who crowded to the teaching of Jerome, and became his most fervent votaries, were some of the most illustrious matrons, widows, and virgins. Marcella had already, when Athanasius was at Rome, become enamoured of the hard and recluse life of the female Egyptian anchorites. But she was for some time alone. The satiric Romans laughed to scorn this new and superstitious Christianity. A layman, Helvidius, wrote a book against it, a book of some popularity, which Jerome answered with his usual controversial fury and contemptuousness. Marcella was a widow of one of the oldest patrician houses, connected with all the consular families and with the prefect of the city. She was extremely rich. She became the most ardent of Jerome's hearers; her example spread with irresistible contagion. The sister of Marcella, Paula, with her two daughters, Blesilla and Eustochium,^m

^k Quem in tantum matronæ diligebant, ut matronarum auriscalpius diceretur.—So says the preface to the hostile petition, the *Libellus Precum*. Apud Sirmond. i. p. 136. The charge of adultery is in Anastasius Vit. Damasi.

^m Among the other names of Jerome's female admirers, one sounds Hebrew,—Lea; some Greek,—Eustochium, Melanium; besides these are Principia, Felicitas, Feliciana, Marcellina, Asella. On Asella and the whole subject, see Hist. of Christi

threw themselves passionately into the same devotion. Paula, like her sister, was very wealthy ; she possessed great part of Nicopolis, the city founded by Augustus to commemorate the battle of Actium. Blesilla, her younger daughter, was a widow at the age of twenty. She rejected the importunate persuasions of her friends to contaminate herself with a second marriage. She abandoned herself entirely to the spiritual direction of Jerome ; her tender frame sank under the cruel penances and macerations which he enjoined. The death of the young and beautiful widow was attributed to these austerities. All Rome took an indignant interest in her fate ; her mother, for her unnatural weakness, became an object of general reprobation, and the public voice loudly denounced Jerome as guilty of her death. A tumult broke out at the funeral ; there was a loud cry,—“Why do we tolerate these accursed monks? Away with them, stone them, cast them into the Tiber!”

The pontificate of Damasus, with those of his two immediate successors, Siricius and Anastasius, is an epoch in the history of Latin Christianity, distinguished by the commencement of three great changes :—I. The progress towards sovereignty, at least over the Western Church : the steps thus made in advance will find their place in the general view of the Papal power on the accession of Innocent I. II. The rapidly increasing power of monasticism. III. The promulgation of a Latin version of the Scriptures, which became the religious code of the West, was received as of equal authority with the original Greek or Hebrew, and thus made the Western independent of the Eastern churches, super-

ant, iii. p. 229, *et seqq.* Compare also a later work, Gfrörer, Kirchen-Geschichte, ii. p. 631, *et seqq.*

seded the original Scriptures for centuries in the greatest part of Christendom, operated powerfully on the growth of Latin Christian literature, contributed to establish Latin as the language of the Church, and still tends to maintain the unity with Rome of all nations whose languages have been chiefly formed from the Latin.

Of both these events, the extension of monasticism, and the promulgation of the Vulgate Bible, Jerome was the author; of the former principally, of the latter exclusively. This was his great and indefeasible title to the appellation of a Father of the Latin Church. Whatever it may owe to the older and fragmentary versions of the sacred writings, Jerome's Bible is a wonderful work, still more as achieved by one man, and that a Western Christian, even with all the advantage of study and of residence in the East. It almost created a new language. The inflexible Latin became pliant and expansive, naturalising foreign Eastern imagery, Eastern modes of expression and of thought, and Eastern religious notions, most uncongenial to its own genius and character; and yet retaining much of its own peculiar strength, solidity, and majesty. If the Northern, the Teutonic languages, coalesce with greater facility with the Orientalism of the Scriptures, it is the triumph of Jerome to have brought the more dissonant Latin into harmony with the Eastern tongues. The Vulgate was even more, perhaps, than the Papal power the foundation of Latin Christianity.

Jerome cherished the secret hope, if it was not the avowed object of his ambition, to succeed Damasus as the Bishop of Rome. He was designated, he says, almost by unanimous consent for that dignity.ⁿ Is the

ⁿ *Omnium pæne judicio, dignus summo sacerdotio decernebatur. Epist. xlv. ad Asellam, 3.*

rejection of an aspirant so singularly unfit for the station, from his violent passions, his insolent treatment of his adversaries, his utter want of self-command, his almost unrivalled faculty of awakening hatred, to be attributed to the sagacious and intuitive wisdom of Rome? Or, as is far more probable, did the vanity of Jerome mistake outward respect for general attachment, awe of his abilities and learning for admiration, and so blind him to the ill-dissembled, if dissembled hostility which he had provoked in so many quarters? It is difficult to refrain from speculating on his elevation. How signally dangerous would it have been to have loaded the rising Papacy with the responsibility or all, or even a large part of the voluminous works of Jerome! The station of a Father of the Church, one of the four great Latin Fathers, committed Christendom to a less close adhesion to all his opinions, while at the same time it placed him above jealous and hostile scrutiny. It was not till two centuries later, when speculative subjects had ceased to agitate the Christian mind, and the creed and the discipline had settled down to a mature and established form, that a Father of the Church, a voluminous writer, could safely appear on the episcopal throne of Rome. Gregory the Great was at once the representative and the voice of the Christianity of his age. Nor could the great work of Jerome have been achieved at Rome, assuredly not by a Pope. It was in his cell at Bethlehem, meditating and completing the Vulgate, that Jerome fixed for centuries the dominion of Latin Christianity over the mind of man. Siricius was the successor of Damasus.^o Jerome left ungrateful Rome, against whose sins the

Pope Siricius.
A D. 384-398.

• Damasus died Dec. 11.

recluse of Palestine becomes even more impassioned, whose clergy and people become blacker and more inexcusable in his harsher and more unsparing denunciations.

The pontificate of Siricius is memorable for the first authentic Decretal, the first letter of the Bishop of Rome, which became a law to the Western Church, and the foundation of the vast system of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. It betrays the Roman tendency to harden into inflexible statute that which was left before to usage, opinion, or feeling. The East enacted creeds, the West discipline.

The Decree of Siricius was addressed to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona.^p Himerius had written before the death of Damasus to consult the Bishop of Rome on certain doubtful points of usage, the validity of heretical baptism, the treatment of apostates, of religious persons guilty of incontinence, the steps which the clergy were to pass through to the higher ranks, and the great question of all, the celibacy of the clergy. The answer of Siricius is in the tone of one who supposes that the usages of the Church of Rome were to be received as those of Christendom. It was to be communicated beyond the province of Tarragona, throughout Spain, in Carthagera, Bætica, Lusitania, Galicia: it appears, by an allusion in a writing of Pope Innocent I., even in Southern Gaul. The all-important article was on the marriage of the clergy; this was peremptorily interdicted, as by an immutable ordinance, to all priests and deacons. This law, while it implied the ascendancy of monastic opinions, showed likewise that there was a large part of the clergy who could only

^p Apud Mansi, sub ann. 385, or Constant. Epist. Pontificum.

be controlled into celibacy by law. Even now the law was forced to make some temporary concessions. Those who confessed that it was a fault, and could plead ignorance that celibacy was an established usage of the Church, were exempted from penalties, but could not hope for promotion to a higher rank.

This unrepealed law was one of the characteristics of Latin Christianity. Her first voice of authority might seem to utter the stern prohibition. This, Celibacy of
the Clergy. more than any other measure, separated the sacerdotal order from the rest of society, from the common human sympathies, interests, affections. It justified them to themselves in assuming a dignity superior to the rest of mankind, and seemed their title to enforce acknowledgment and reverence for that superior dignity. The Monastic principle admitting, virtually at least, almost to its full extent, the Manichean tenet of the innate sinfulness of all sexual intercourse as partaking of the inextinguishable impurity of Matter, was gradually wrought into the general feeling. Whether marriage was treated as in itself an evil, perhaps to be tolerated, but still degrading to human nature, as by Jerome^a and the more ascetic teachers; or honoured, as by Augustine, with a specious adulation, only to exalt virginity to a still loftier height above it: the clergy were taught to assert it at once as a privilege, as

^a On Jerome's views see quotations Hist. of Christianity, iii. 221, *et seqq.*

^b Gaudium virginum Christi:—de Christo, in Christo, cum Christo, post Christum, per Christum, propter Christum. Sequantur itaque agnum qui virginitatem corporis amiserunt,

non quocunque ille ierit, sed quousque ipsi potuerint. De Sanct. Virgin. cap. 27.—The virgin and her mother may both be in heaven, but one a bright, the other a dim star. *Serm.* 354, ad Continent.

a distinction, as the consummation and the testimony to the sacredness of their order. As there was this perpetual appeal to their pride (they were thus visibly set apart from the vulgar, the rest of mankind),^s so they were compelled to its observance at once by the law of the Church, and by the fear of falling below their perpetual rivals, the monks, in the general estimation. The argument of their greater usefulness to Christian society, of their more entire devotion to the duties of their holy function by being released from the cares and duties of domestic life; the noble Apostolic motive, that they ought to be bound to the world by few, and those the most fragile ties, in order more fearlessly to incur danger, or to sacrifice even life more readily in the cause of the Cross; such low incentives were disdained as beneath consideration. Some hardy opponents, Helvidius, Jovinian, Vigilantius, and others of more obscure name, endeavoured to stem the mingling tide of authority and popular sentiment; they were swept away by its resistless force.^t They boldly called in question the first principles of the new Christian theory, and in the name of reason, nature, and the New Testament, denied this inherent perfection of virginity, as compared with lawful marriage. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine lifted up at once their voices against these unexpected and mistimed adversaries. Jerome went so far in his disparagement of marriage, as to be disclaimed by his own ardent admirers; but still his adversaries have been handed down to posterity under the ill-omened name of heretics, solely, or almost solely on this account. They

^s Quid interesset inter populum et sacerdotem, si isdem adstringerentur legibus. Ambros. Epist. lxxiii. ad Eccl. Verzell.

^t I have entered somewhat more at length into this controversy in the Hist. of Christianity.

live in his vituperative pages, objects of scorn *more* than of hatred. So unpopular was their resistance to the spirit of the age. The general feeling shuddered at their refusal to admit that which had now become one of the leading articles of Latin Christian faith. Yet, notwithstanding this, the law of the Celibacy of the Clergy, even though imposed with such overweening authority, was not received without some open and more *tacit* resistance. There were few, perhaps, courageous or far-sighted enough to oppose the principle itself, though even among bishops Jovinian was not without followers. Others, incautiously admitting the principle, struggled to escape from its consequences. In some regions the married clergy formed the majority, and, always supporting married bishops by their suffrages and influence, kept up a formidable succession. Still Christendom was against them; and in most cases, those who were conscientiously opposed to these austere restrictions, had recourse to evasions or secret violations of the law, infinitely more dangerous to public morals. Throughout the whole period, from Pope Siricius to the Reformation, as must appear in the course of our history, the law was defied, infringed, eluded. It never obtained anything approaching to general observance, though its violation was at times more open, at times more clandestine.

The Pontificates of Damasus and Siricius beheld
extinction of Paganism. almost the last open struggles of expiring Roman Paganism, the dispute concerning the Statue of Victory in the Senate, the secession of a large number of the more distinguished senators, the pleadings of the eloquent Symmachus for the toleration of the religion of ancient Rome. To such humiliation were reduced the deities of the Capitol, the gods, who,

as was supposed, had achieved the conquest of the world, and laid it at the feet of Rome. But in this great contest the Bishop of Rome filled only an inferior part; it was Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, who enforced the final sentence of condemnation against paganism, asserted the sin, in a Christian Emperor, of assuming any Imperial title connected with pagan worship, and of permitting any portion of the public revenue to be expended on the rites of idolatry. It was Ambrose, who forbade the last marks of respect to the tutelar divinities of Rome in the public ceremonies.

Latin Christianity, in truth, in all but its monarchical strength, in its unity under one Head, and under one code of ecclesiastical law, enacted and executed in its last resort by that Head, was established in its dominion over the human mind without the walls of Rome. It was Jerome, who sent forth the Vulgate from his retreat in Palestine; it was Ambrose of Milan who raised the sacerdotal power to more than independence, limited the universal homage paid to the Imperial authority, protected youthful and feeble Emperors, and in the name of justice and of humanity rebuked the greatest sovereign of the age. It was Augustine, Bishop of the African Hippo, who organized Latin theology; wrought Christianity into the minds and hearts of men by his impassioned autobiography; and finally, under the name of the "City of God," established that new and undefined kingdom, at the head of which the Bishop of Rome was hereafter to place himself as Sovereign; that vast polity, which was to rise out of the ruins of ancient and pagan Rome; if not to succeed at once to the temporal supremacy, to superinduce a higher government, that of God himself. This divine government was sure eventually to fall to those who were already

aspiring to be the earthly representatives of God. The Theocracy of Augustine, comprehending both worlds, Heaven as well as earth, was far more sublime, as more indefinite, than the spiritual monarchy of the later Popes. It established, it contemplated no such external or visible autocracy, but it prepared the way for it in the minds of men; the spiritual City of God became a secular monarchy ruling by spiritual means.

It may be well here to close the fourth century of Christianity, which ended in the uneventful pontificate of Anastasius I. Four hundred years had now elapsed since the birth of the Redeemer. The Gospel was the established religion of both parts of the Roman Empire; Greek and Latin Christianity divided the Roman world. Most of the barbarians, who had settled within the frontiers of the Empire, had submitted to her religion. With Christianity the hierarchical system had embraced the world.

BOOK II.—CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

POPE	BISHOPS OF CONSTANTINOPLE		PATRIARCHS OF ALEXANDRIA		PATRIARCHS OF ANTIOCH		BISHOPS OF JERUSALEM		EMPERORS OF THE WEST.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	
	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
402 Innocent I.	417	397. Chrysostom 404 Arsacius 406 Anatolius.	395 Theophrastus 405 406	404 Flavianus 404 Porphyrius	404 414	404 414	396 John 416	395 Arcadius. 408 Theodosius II.	425 425	395 Arcadius. 408 Theodosius II.	408	408
417 Zosimus.	418		412 Cyril.	441	414 Alexander.	421	416 Praxius	428				
418 Bonifacius 418 (Eutimius, Antiope).	422 419											
422 Celestinus I.	432.	426 Sissinius 428 Nicetius, (deposed)			424 Theodorus 425 John I.	419 442.	428 Juvenalis.	436	424. Valentinian III.	455		
422 Sixtus III.	440	431 Maximianus. 434 Proclus.			442. Domnus II (deposed.)	449						
440. Leo I.	461.	447 Flavianus, (murdered)	444. Dioscorus, (deposed)	451	449 Maximus	455.						
		449 Anatolius.			456 Basilus.	458.	452. Anastasius	472.	455 Maximus Averius. Majorian.	461. 461. Severus.	450. Marcian. 457. Leo I.	457.
		456 Gennadius.	451 Proterius, Eutimius, re- val bishop.	460	456 Aecius.	459						474
			460 Salustianus T. Aelurus.	447.	460 Martynus, (abdicated.)	471						

BOOK II.



CHAPTER I.

Innocent I.

THE fifth century of Christianity has begun, and now arises a line of Roman prelates, some of them from their personal character, as well as from the circumstances of the time, admirably qualified to advance the supremacy of the See of Rome, at least over Western Christendom.

Christianity, in its Latin form, which for centuries was to be its most powerful, enduring, prolific development, wanted, for her stability and unity of influence, a capital and a centre; and Rome might seem deserted by her emperors for the express purpose of allowing the spiritual monarchy to grow up without any dangerous collision against the civil government. The Emperors had long withdrawn from Rome as the royal residence. Of those who bore the title, one ruled in Constantinople, and, more and more absorbed in the cares and calamities of the Eastern sovereignty, became gradually estranged from the affairs of the West. Nor was it till the time of Justinian that any attempt was made to revive his imperial pretensions to Rome. The Western Emperor lingered for a time in inglorious obscurity among the marshes of Ravenna, till at length the faint shadow of monarchy melted away, and a bar-

Rome centre
of the West.

barian assumed the power and the appellation of Sovereign of Italy. Still, of the barbarian kings, not one ventured to fix himself in the ancient capital, or to inhabit the mouldering palaces of the older Cæsars. Nor could Ravenna, Milan, or Pavia, though the seats of monarchs, obscure the greatness of Rome in general reverence: they were still provincial cities; nor could they divert the tide of commerce, of concourse, of legal, if not of administrative business, which, however more irregular and intermitting, still flowed towards Rome. The internal government of the city retained something of the old republican form which had been permitted to subsist under the despotism of the emperors. Above the consuls or Senate, the shadows of former magistracies, the supreme authority was vested in a delegate, or representative of the Emperor, the prefect, or governor; but, with the empire, that authority became more and more powerless. The aristocracy, as we shall ere long see, were scattered abroad after the capture of the city by Alaric, and were never after reorganised into a powerful party. Some centuries elapsed before that feudal oligarchy grew up, which, at a later period, were such dangerous enemies to the Papacy, degrading it to the compulsory appointment of turbulent or immoral prelates, or by the personal insult, and even the murder, of popes. During the following period, therefore, the Bishop of Rome, respected by the barbarians, even by the fiercest pagans, none of whom were quite without awe of the high priesthood of the Roman religion, and, by that respect, commended still more strongly to the reverence of all Latin Christians; alone hallowed, as it were, and permitted to maintain his serene dignity amid scenes of violence, confusion, and bloodshed; grew rapidly up to be the most important

person in the city; if not in form the supreme magistrate, yet dominant in influence and admitted authority, the all-venerated Head of the Church; and where the civil power thus lay prostrate, assuming, without awakening jealousy and for the public advantage, many of its functions, and maintaining some show of order and of rule.

It was not solely as a Christian bishop, and bishop of that city, which was still, according to the prevailing feeling, the capital of the world, but as the successor of St. Peter, of him who was now acknowledged to be the head of the apostolic body, that the Roman pontiff commanded the veneration of Rome and of Christendom. The primacy of St. Peter, and the primacy of Rome, had been long reacting upon each other in the minds of men, and took root in the general sentiment. The Church of Rome would own no founder less than the chief Apostle; and the distance between St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles, even St. Paul himself, was increased by his being acknowledged as the spiritual ancestor of the Bishop of Rome. At the commencement of the fifth century, the lineal descent of the Pope from St. Peter was an accredited tenet of Christianity. As yet his pretensions to supremacy were vague and unformed; but when authority is in the ascendant, it is the stronger for being indefinite. It is almost a certain sign that it is becoming precarious, or has been called in question, when it condescends to appeal to precedent, written statute, or regular jurisdiction.

Everything tended to confirm, nothing to impede or to weaken the gradual condensation of the supreme ecclesiastical power in the Supreme Bishop. The majesty of the notion of one all-powerful ruler, to which

the world had been so long familiarised in the emperors ; the discord and emulation among the other prelates, both of the East and West, and the manifest advantage of a supreme arbiter ; the Unity of the visible Church, which was becoming—or had indeed, ^{Unity of the Church.} become—the dominant idea of Christendom ; all seemed to demand, or, at least, had a strong tendency to promote and to maintain the necessity of one Supreme Head. As the unity in Christ was too sublimely spiritual, so the supremacy of the collective episcopate, which endowed each bishop with an equal portion of apostolic dignity and of power, was a notion too speculative and metaphysical for the common mind. Councils were only occasional diets, or general conventions, not a standing representative Senate of Christendom. There was a simplicity and distinctness in the conception of one visible Head to one visible body, such as forcibly arrests and fully satisfies the less inquiring mind, which still seeks something firm and stable whereon to repose its faith. Cyprian, in whom the unity of the Church had taken its severest form, though practically he refused to submit the independence of the African churches to the dictation of Rome, did far more to advance her power by the primacy which he assigned to St. Peter, than he impaired it by his steady and disdainful repudiation of her authority, whenever it was brought to the test of submission.*

In the West, throughout Latin Christendom, the Roman See, in antiquity, in dignity, in the more regular

* Qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est Ecclesia, deserit, in ecclesiâ se esse confidit? This was a plain and intelligible doctrine. Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum

pars tenetur—was a conception far more vague and abstract, and, therefore, far less popular. De Unit. Eccl. See for the dispute with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, ch. i.

succession of its prelates, stood alone and unapproachable. In the great Eastern bishoprics the holy lineage had been already broken and confused by the claims of rival prelates, by the usurpation of bishops accounted heretical, at the present period Arians or Macedonians or Apollinarians, later Nestorians or Monophysites. Jerusalem had never advanced that claim to which it might seem entitled by its higher antiquity. Jerusalem was not universally acknowledged as an Apostolic See; at all events it was the capital of Judaism rather than of Christianity; and the succession, at the time of the Jewish war, and during the period of desolation to the time of Hadrian, had been interrupted at least in its local descent. At one period Jerusalem was subordinate to the Palestinian Cæsarea. Antioch had been perpetually contested; its episcopal line had been vitiated, its throne contaminated by the actual succession of several Arian prelates.^b In Alexandria the Arian prelates had been considered lawless usurpers the orthodox Church had never voluntarily submitted to their jurisdiction; and Alexandria had been hallowed as the episcopal seat of the great Athanasius. But Athanasius himself, when driven from his see, had found a hospitable reception at Rome, and constant support from the Roman Bishops. His presence had reflected a glory upon that see, which, but for one brief period of compulsory apostacy, had remained rigidly attached to the orthodox Trinitarian opinions. Constantinople was but a new city, and had no pretensions to venerable or

^b The obvious difficulty of the Primacy of Antioch as the first See of St. Peter, which, it might seem, had been, if not objected, at least suggested, was thus met by Innocent I. *Quæ urbis Romæ sedî non cederet, nisi quod ipsa in transitu meruit, ista susceptum apud se, consummatumque gaudet.* — Innocent. Epis. xix. ad Alexand.

apostolic origin. It had attained, indeed to the dignity of a patriarchate, but only by the decree of a recent council; in other respects it owed all its eminence to being the prelacy of new Rome, of the seat of empire. The feuds and contests between the rival patriarchates of the East were constantly promoting the steady progress of Rome towards supremacy. Throughout the fierce rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople, the hostilities which had even now begun between Theophilus and Chrysostom, and which were continued with implacable violence between Cyril and Nestorius, Flavianus and Dioscorus, the alliance of the Bishop of Rome was too important not to be purchased at any sacrifice; and if the independence of the Eastern churches was compromised, if not by an appeal to Rome, at least by the ready admission of her interference, the leaders of the opposing parties were too much occupied by their immediate objects, and blinded by factious passions, to discern or to regard the consequences of these silent aggressions. From the personal or political objects of these feuds the Bishop of Rome might stand aloof; in the religious questions he might mingle in undisturbed dignity, or might offer himself as mediator, just as he might choose the occasion, and almost on his own terms. At the same time, not merely on the great subject of the Trinity, had Rome repudiated the more obnoxious heresy, even on less vital questions, the Latin capital happy in the exemption from controversial bishops, had rarely swerved from the canon of severe orthodoxy; and if any one of her bishops had been forced or perplexed into a rash or erroneous decision, as Liberius, during his short concession to semi-Arianism; or, as we shall see before long, Zosimus to Pelagianism; and a still later pope, who was bewildered into Monophysitism; their

errors were effaced by a speedy, full, and glorious recantation.

Thus the East, agitated by furious conflicts concerning the highest doctrines of Christianity, concerning the pre-eminence of the rival sees for dominant influence with the Emperor, was still throwing itself, as each faction was oppressed by its rival, at the feet of remote and more impartial Rome. In the West, at the same time, the disputes which were constantly arising about points of discipline, the succession of bishops, the boundaries of conflicting jurisdictions, still demanded and were glad to have recourse to a foreign arbitrator; and who so fitting an arbiter as the Bishop of that city, which, in theory at least, was still the centre of civil government, the seat of Cæsar's tribunal, to whom the Roman world had acquired a settled and inveterate habit of appeal? Rome, the mother of civil, might likewise give birth to canonical jurisprudence.^c

For the great talisman of the Papal influence was the yet majestic name of Rome. The bishops gave laws to the city, which had so long given, and still to so great an extent, gave laws to the world. In the sentiment of mankind, at least in the West, Rome had never been dethroned from her supremacy. There were still Roman armies, Roman laws, Roman municipalities, Roman literature, in name at least a Roman Empire.^d Constantinople boasted rather than disdained

^c Until the Roman Curia became inordinate in its exactions, and so utterly venal as it is universally represented in later centuries, this arbitration, when so much was yet unsettled, while the new society was yet in the process of formation, must

have tended to peace and so to the strength of Christianity.

^d See in Ausonius the curious order of the cities of the Empire.—1. Prima urbes inter, divum domus, aurea Roma. — 2. Constantinople, before whom bows 3. Carthage—4. An-

the appellation of New Rome. But while the Bishops of Rome retained much of the awe and reverence which adhered to the name, they stood aloof from all which desecrated and degraded it. It was the idolatrous and pagan Rome which fell before the barbarians, or rather was visited for its vices and crimes, its persecutions, and its still obstinate infidelity, by those terrible instruments of the divine vengeance. As our history will show, the discomfiture of the heathen Rhadagaisus, and the tutelary, though partial, protection which Christianity spread over the city during the capture by Alaric (to which Augustine triumphantly appealed), were not obliterated by the unawed and remorseless devastation of Genseric. The retreat of Attila, the most terrible of all the Northern conquerors, before the imposing sanctity, as it was universally believed, of Pope Leo, blended again in indissoluble alliance the sacred security of Rome with the authority of her bishop. Leo himself, as will be hereafter seen, exalts St. Peter and St. Paul into the Romulus and Remus of the new universal Roman dominion.

It was at this period (the commencement of the fifth century), when the Imperial power was declining towards extinction in the hands of the feeble Honorius, and the Roman arms were for the last time triumphant, under Stilicho, over the Northern barbarians, that a prelate was placed on the episcopal throne of Rome, of a bolder and more imperious nature, of unimpeachable holiness, who held the pontifical power for a longer period than usual in the rapid succession of

Accession of
Innocent.

Joch—5. Alexandria—6. Treves—7. | — 16. Narbonne — 17. Bordeaux.
Milan—8. Capua—9. Aquileia—10. The poet is a Gaul, a native of Bor-
Arles—11. Merida—12. Athens—13. deaux. Ravenna seems to have fallen
* Catania, Syracuse—15. Toulouse into obscurity. Ausonii Poem.

the bishops of Rome. Ambrose was now dead, and there was no Western prelate, at least in Europe, whose fame and abilities could obscure that pre-eminence, which rank and position, and in his case, commanding character, bestowed on the Bishop of Rome. Innocent, like most of the greater Popes, was by birth, if not a

A.D. 402. Roman, of the Roman territory. He was born at Albano.* The patriotism of a Roman might mingle with his holier aspirations for the spiritual greatness of the ancient mistress of the world. Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline.

Up to the accession of Innocent, the steps by which the See of Rome, during the preceding century, had advanced towards the legal recognition of a supremacy, were few but not unimportant; the first had been made by the Council of Sardica, the renown of whose resolute orthodoxy gave it peculiar weight in all parts of Christendom, where the Athanasian Trinitarianism maintained its ascendancy. It is not difficult to trace the motives which influenced the Bishops of Sardica. Great principles are often established by measures which grow out of temporary interests. The Western orthodox Bishops at Sardica hardly escaped being out-numbered by their heretical adversaries; there were ninety-four on one side, seventy-six on the other. Had not the turbulent, but irresolute, minority withdrawn to Philip-

* There is an expression in one of St. Jerome's letters, which, taken literally, asserts Innocent to have been the son of his predecessor Anastasius. *Qui apostolicæ cathedræ et supradicti viri successor et filius est.* Is it to be presumed that this is an incautious metaphor of St. Jerome?

popolis, and there set up a rival synod, the issue might have been almost doubtful; at all events, where parties were so evenly balanced, intrigue, accident, activity on one part, supineness on the other, or the favour of the Emperor, might summon an assembly, in which the preponderance would be in favour of Arianism (it was so a few years after at Rimini); and thus might heresy gain the sanction of a Council of Christendom. But Rome had, up to this time, before the fall of Liberius, so firmly, so repeatedly, so solemnly, embraced the cause of Athanasius, that it might seem to be irrevocably committed to orthodoxy; an appeal to Rome, therefore, would always give an opportunity to an orthodox minority, to annul or to suspend the decrees of an heretical Church. In all causes, therefore, of bishops (and not merely were the bishops in general the chief members of Councils, but the first proceeding of all the Councils, at this period, was to depose the prelates of the opposite party) an appeal to Rome would both secure a second hearing, by more favourable judges, of the subject under controversy, and might maintain, notwithstanding adverse decrees, all the orthodox bishops upon their thrones. The Council of Sardica, therefore, in its canons, established the law, that on an appeal to the Bishop of Rome, he might decide whether the judgement was to be reconsidered, and appoint judges for the second hearing of the cause; he might even, if he thought fit, take the initiative; and delegate an ecclesiastic "from his side," to institute a commission of inquiry.^f

^f Et si judicaverit renovandum esse quæ decreverant, confirmata erant. judicium, renovetur, et det judices; si Can. 3.—Can. 5 permits him to send autem probaverit, talem causam esse, this presbyterum a latere. Mansi, ut non refricetur, ea quæ acta sunt, sub ann.

The right of appeal to Rome, thus established by ecclesiastical, was confirmed by Imperial authority during the reign of Valentinian III. Up to
A.D. 421.
Law of
Valentinian. that time the Emperors, if they did not possess by the constitution of the Church, exercised nevertheless by virtue of their supreme and indefeasible authority, and by the irresistible, and, as yet rarely contested, tenure of power, the right of summary decision in religious as in civil causes. A feeble emperor would willingly devolve on a more legitimate court these troublesome and perplexing affairs. To a monarch, another spiritual Monarch would appear at once the most natural and the most efficient delegate to relieve him from these burthens; he would feel no jealousy of such useful and unconflicting autocracy; and the Western Emperor would of course invest in this part of the Imperial prerogative the Bishop of the Imperial City.

Now too the temporal power, the Empire, was sinking rapidly into the decrepitude of age, the Papacy rising in the first vigour of its youthful ambition. Honorius was cowering in the palace of Ravenna from the perils which were convulsing the empire on all sides, while the provinces were withdrawing their doubtful allegiance, or in danger of being dis severed from the Roman dominion. Innocent was on the episcopal throne of Rome, asserting his almost despotic spiritual control over those very provinces.

Innocent, in his assertion of supremacy, might seem to disdain the authority of Council or Emperor. He declares, in one of his earliest epistles, that all the churches of the West, not of Italy alone, but of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, having been planted by St. Peter and his successors, owe filial obedience to the parent See, are bound to follow her example in all points of

discipline, and to maintain a rigid uniformity with all her usages.⁵ To the minutest point Rome will again be the legislator of the world; and it is singular to behold a representative, as it were, of each of these provinces bringing the first fruits of that deference, which was construed into unlimited allegiance, to the feet of the majestic Pontiff. The Bishop of Rouen requests from the Bishop of Rome, the rules of ecclesiastical discipline observed within his See.^h Innocent approves the zeal of the Gaulish Bishop for uniformity, so contrary to the lawless spirit of innovation, which prevailed in some parts of the Christian world; and sends him a book containing certain regulations of peculiar severity, especially as to the celibacy of the clergy. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, is com-
 404. Feb. 15
 mended in a still more lofty and protecting tone of condescension for his wise recourse to the See of Rome, rather than the usurpation of undue authority.ⁱ To the Spanish Synod of Toledo, the Bishop of Rome speaks something in the character of an appellant judge. The province of Illyricum, including Macedonia and Greece, on the original division, had been adjudged to the Western Empire. The Bishop of Rome exercised a certain jurisdiction, granted or recognised by the

^a Cum sit manifestum in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam insulasque intervenientes nullum instituisse ecclesias nisi eos quos venerabilis Apostolus Petrus ejusque successores constituerunt sacerdotes. Epist. ad Decent. Episcop. Eugubini.

Jaffe dates this Epist. 416. March 19. Labbe, ii. p. 1249.

^b In the third rule, which gives the provincia. synods of bishops supreme authority in their own province, the

words "sine prejudicio tamen Romanae ecclesiae, cui in omnibus causis debet reverentia custodiri," are rejected as a late interpolation. Epist. ad Victricium. Labbe, ii. p. 1249.

ⁱ Dilectio tua institutum secuta prudentium, ad sedem apostolicam referre maluit, quid de rebus dubiis custodiri deberet, potius quam usurpatione praesumptâ, quæ sibi viderentur, de singulis obtinere. Ad Exup. Episc. Tol. Labbe, ii. p. 1254.

Council of Sardica, as the Metropolitan of the West.

405. Feb. *Damasus had appointed the Bishop of Thessa-*

lonica, as a kind of legate or representative of his authority. Innocent, in his epistle to the Bishops of Macedonia, expresses a haughty astonishment that his decisions are not admitted without examination, and gravely insinuates that some wrong may be intended to the dignity of the Apostolical See.¹ More doubtful was the allegiance of Africa. At the commencement of

A.D. 414. Innocent's pontificate, his influence with the

Emperor was solicited for the suppression of the obstinate Donatists. Towards the close of his life, a correspondence took place concerning Pelagius and his doctrines. The African Churches, even Augustine himself, did not disguise their apprehension, that Innocent might be betrayed into an approbation of those tenets; they desired to strengthen their own stern and peremptory decrees with the concurrence of the Bishop of Rome. The language of Innocent was in his wonted imperious style; the African Churches seem to have treated his pretensions to superiority with silent disregard.

In the East, Constantinople, Alexandria, and even

Innocent and
Chrysostom.

A.D. 401.

Antioch, were driven by their own bitter feuds and hostilities, to court the alliance of Rome; it could hardly be without some compromise of independence.

In espousing the cause of Chrysostom against his

¹ In quibus (epistolis) multa posita pervidi quæ stuporem mentibus nostris inducerent, facerentque nos non modicum dubitare utrum aliter putarem us an ita esse posita, quemadmodum persolabant. Quæ cum sæpius repeti

fecissem, adverti, sedi apostolicæ ad quam relatio, quasi ad caput ecclesiarum missa esse debebat, aliquam fieri injuriam, cujus adhuc in ambiguum sententia, duceretur. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. Labbe, ii. 1272.

rival Theophilus of Alexandria, Innocent took that side which was supported by the better and wiser, as well as by the popular voice of Christendom. He was the fearless advocate of persecuted holiness, of eloquence, of ecclesiastical dignity, against the aggressions of a violent foreign prelate, who was interfering in an independent diocese, and against the intrigues of a court notoriously governed by female influence. The slight asperities of Chrysostom's character, the monastic austerities which seemed to some ill suited to the magnificence of so great a prelate, the aggressions on the privileges of some churches not strictly under his jurisdiction, but which were notoriously ventured for the promotion of Christian holiness by the suppression of simony and other worse vices; these less obvious causes of Chrysostom's unpopularity hardly transpired beyond the limits of his diocese, were lost in the dazzling splendour of his talents and his virtues, or forgotten among his cruel wrongs.* Chrysostom appeared before the more distant Christian world as the greatest orator who had ever ascended the pulpit of the church. His name, the Golden Mouth, expressed the universal admiration of his powers.

After having held Antioch under the spell of his oratory for many years, Chrysostom had been called to the episcopal throne of the Eastern Metropolis by general acclamation. Now, notwithstanding the fond attachment of the greater part of Constantinople, and the manifest interposition, as it was supposed, of heaven, which on his banishment had shaken the guilty city with an earthquake and compelled his triumphant recall, he was again driven from his see, degraded by the precipitate decree of an illegal and partial council, and exposed to the

most merciless persecution. The one crime, which could have blinded into hatred the love and admiration of the Christian world, heterodoxy of opinion, was not charged against him by his most malicious enemies. His only ostensible delinquency was the uncompromising rebuke of vice in high places, and disrespect to the Imperial Majesty, which, even if true to the utmost, however it might astonish the timidity, or shock the servility of the East, in the West, to which the dominion of Arcadius and Eudoxia did not extend, would be deemed only a bold and salutary assertion of episcopal dignity and Christian courage. The letter addressed by Chrysostom, according to the copies in the Greek writers, to the three great prelates of the West, the Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, in the Roman copies to Innocent alone,¹ was written with all his glowing fervour and brilliant perspicuity. After describing the scenes of outrage and confusion in the church at Easter, the violation of the sanctuary, and the insults inflicted on the sacred persons of priests and dedicated virgins and bishops, the Bishop of Constantinople entreats the friendly interposition of the Western prelates to obtain

¹ There is great variation in different parts of the Roman copy: it is sometimes addressed to persons in the plural number, sometimes to an individual in the singular. This appears to me no very important argument, though adduced by the most candid Protestant writers, *e.g.* Shroock. This cry of distress would not be carefully or suspiciously worded, so as to provide against any incautious admission of superiority, of which Chrysostom, under such circumstances, thought little, even if any such claims had

been already made. But the strongest proofs (if I must enter into the controversy) that Chrysostom and his followers addressed themselves to the bishops of Italy, as well as to that of Rome, seems to me the very passage in the Epistle of the Emperor Honorius, which is adduced, even by Pagi, to prove the contrary. *Missi ad sacerdotes urbis æternæ atque Italiae utrâque ex parte legati; expectabatur ex omnium auctoritate sententia . . . Namque hi, quorum expectabatur aucto-*

a general and legitimate Council empowered to examine the whole affair. The answer of Innocent is calm, moderate, dignified, perhaps artful. He expresses his awful horror at these impious scenes of violence, deep interest in the fate of Chrysostom; he does not however prejudge the question, he does not even refuse to communicate with Theophilus, till after the solemn decree of a council. Yet the sympathies of Innocent, as of all the better part of Christendom, were with the eloquent, oppressed, and patient exile. The sentiments as well as the influence of the Roman prelate were ere long proclaimed to the world, by an Imperial letter in favour of Chrysostom, which no persuasion but that of Innocent could have obtained from the Emperor of the West. Honorius openly espoused the cause of the exile: and though, throughout the whole of the transaction, the East, with something of the irritable ^{A.D. 406.} consciousness of wrong and injustice, resented the interference of the West, and treated the messengers of the Italian prelates with studied neglect and contumely, the defenders of Chrysostom were so clearly on the side of justice, humanity, generous compassion for the oppressed, as well as of ecclesiastical order, that the Bishop of Rome, the Head at least of the Italian prelates, could not but rise in the general estimation of Christendom. The fidelity of Innocent to the cause of Chrysostom did not cease with the death of the persecuted prelate: he refused to communicate with Atticus, his successor, or the usurper, according to the conflicting parties, of the See of Constantinople, unless Atticus would acknowledge Chrysostom to have been the rightful bishop until his death.^m Common reverence for Chrysostom. and

^m There is a regular act of excommunication, in some of the Latin writers—(it was brought to light by Baronius)—in which Innocent boldly

common hostility to Atticus, brought Innocent into close alliance with Alexander, Bishop of Antioch. A.D. 416. During his correspondence with Alexander, Innocent is disposed to attribute a subordinate primacy to Antioch, as the temporary See of St. Peter. Rome now chose to rest her title to supremacy on the succession from the great Apostle. Peter could hardly have passed through any see, without leaving behind him some inheritance of peculiar dignity; while Rome, as the scene of his permanent residence and martyrdom, claimed the undoubted succession to almost monarchical supremacy.

That which might have appeared the most fatal blow to Roman greatness, as dissolving the spell of Roman empire, the capture, the conflagration, the plunder, the depopulation of Rome by the barbarian Goths, tended directly to establish and strengthen the spiritual supremacy of Rome. It was pagan Rome, the Babylon of sensuality, pride, and idolatry which fell before the triumphant Alaric; the Goths were the instruments of divine vengeance against paganism, which lingered in this its last stronghold. Christianity hastened to disclaim all interest, all sympathy in the fate of the "harlot that sat on the seven

excludes the Emperor Arcadius from the communion of the faithful. It is expressed with all the proud humility, the unctuous imperiousness of a later period. It is given up, by all the more sensible writers of the Roman Catholic church, principally on account of a fatal blunder. It includes the Dalila, the Empress Eudoxia, under the Anathema. Eudoxia had been dead several years. (See Pagi, sub ann. 407.) I

am in constant perplexity; fearing, on one hand, to omit all notice of, on the other feeling something like contempt for, these forgeries, which are always so injurious to the cause they wish to serve. As an impartial historical inquirer, I continually rise from them with my suspicion, even of better attested documents, so much sharpened, that I have to struggle vigorously against a general scepticism.

hills." Paganism might seem rashly to accept this desperate issue, girding itself for one final effort, and proclaiming, that as Rome had brought ruin on her own head by abandoning her gods, so her gods had for ever abandoned the unfaithful capital. The eternal city was manifestly approaching one of the epochs in her eternity. Three times during the first ~~ten~~ years of the fifth century and of the pontificate of Innocent, the first time under Alaric, ~~the second~~ under Rhadagaisus, the third again under Alaric, the barbarians crossed the Alps with overwhelming forces. Twice the valour and military abilities of one man, Stilicho, diverted the storm from the walls of Rome. In his first expedi- <sup>400 to 403.
Battle of
Pollentia.</sup> tion Alaric, after his defeat at Pollentia,ⁿ endeavoured to throw himself upon the capital. He was recalled by the skilful movements of Stilicho, to suffer a final discomfiture under the walls of Verona. The poet commemorates the victories of Stilicho, the triumph of Honorius in Rome for these victories. In the splendid verses on the ovation of Honorius, it is no wonder that Pope Innocent finds no place. Claudian maintains his invariable and total silence as to the existence of Christianity. From his royal mansion on the Palatine Honorius looks down on no more glorious sight than the temples of his ancestors, which crowd the Forum in their yet inviolable majesty; the eye is dazzled and confounded with the blaze of their bronzed columns and their roofs of gold; and with their statues which studded the skies: they are the household gods of the emperor. That the emperor worshipped other gods, or was ruled by other priests, appears from no one

word.* The Jove of the Capitol might seem still the tutelar god of Rome. Claudian had wound up his poem on the Gothic war, in which he equals the victory of Pollentia with that of Marius over the Cimbrians; he ends with that solemn admonition, "Let the frantic barbarians learn hence respect for Rome."

But three years after, the terrible Rhadagaisus, at the head of an enormous force of mingled barbarians, swept over the whole North of Italy, and encamped before the walls of Florence. Rhadagaisus was a pagan; he sacrificed daily to some deity, whom the Latin writers call by the name of Jove. The party at Rome, attached to their ancient worship, are accused of having contemplated with more than secret joy the approach of, it might seem, the irresistible barbarian. They did this, notwithstanding his terrible threats that he would sacrifice the senate of Rome on the altars of the gods which delight in human blood. The common enmity to Christianity, according to St. Augustine, quenched the love of their country, their proud attachment to Rome. But God himself, by the unexpected discomfiture of Rhadagaisus, crushed their guilty hopes, and rescued

A.D. 405.

Rome from the public restoration of paganism.

The consummate generalship of Stilicho,^p by which he gradually enclosed the vast forces of Rhadagaisus among the mountains in the neighbourhood of Florence, himself on the ridge of Fæsulæ, till they died off by

* "Tot circum delubra videt, tantisque
Deorum
Cingitur excubils. Juvat infra tecta
Tonantis
Cernere Tarpeia pendentes rupe Gigan-
tas,
Cælataque fores, mediisque volantia
signa
Nubibus, et densum stipantibus æthera
templis
Acies stupet igne metalli.

Et circumfuso trepidans obtunditur auro,
Agnosce tuos, Princeps venerande,
Penates?"—*de VI. Cons. Hon.* 43, 53.

Compare on Claudian note in Hist. of Christianity.

^p Gibbon, loc. cit., will furnish the authorities.

famine and disease, was utterly incomprehensible to his age. Christianity took to itself the whole glory of Stilicho, the relief of Florence, the dispersion and reduction to captivity of the barbaric forces, and the death of Rhadagaisus, who was ordered to summary execution. A vision of St. Ambrose had predicted the relief of Florence, and nothing less than the immediate succour of God, or of his Apostles, could account for the unexpected victory: and this strong religious feeling no doubt mingled with the common infatuation which seized all parties. Rome, it was thought, with a feeble emperor at a distance, with few troops, and those mostly barbarians, was safe in the majesty of her name and the prescriptive awe of mankind. Christ, or her tutelar Apostles, who had revealed the discomfiture of Rhadagaisus, had protected, and would to the end protect, Christian Rome against all pagan invaders, baffle the treasonable sympathy, and disperse the sacrilegious prayers, of those who, true to the ancient religion, were false to the real greatness of Rome. So often as heathen forces should menace the temples, not of the Capitoline Jove, or those yet uncleansed from the pollutions of their idolatries, but those, if less splendid, more holy fanes protected by the relics of Apostles and Martyrs, Rome would witness, as she had already witnessed, the triumph of her Christian emperor, the consecration of the spoils of the defeated barbarians on the altars of St. Paul, St. Peter, and of Christ.^a

The sacrifice of Stilicho^r to the dark intrigues of the

^a Paulinus in vit. Ambrosii, c. 50. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, v. 23. Orosius, vii. 37.

^{*} Stilicho was married to Serena,

the sister of Honorius. Honorius had married in succession Maria and Thermantia, the daughters of Stilicho.

court of Ravenna was the last fatal sign of this pride and security. Both Christian and pagan writers combine to load the memory of Stilicho with charges manifestly intended to exculpate the court of Honorius from the guilt and folly of his disgrace, his surrender by a Christian bishop after he had sought, himself a Christian, sanctuary at the altar of the church of Ravenna, and his perfidious execution. The Christians accuse him of a design to depose the emperor, who was both his brother-in-law and his son-in-law, and to elevate his own heir Eucherius to the Imperial throne. Eucherius, it is asserted, but with no proof, and with all probability against it, was a pagan; the public restoration of paganism, as the religion of the Empire, was to be the first act of the new dynasty.⁵ The ungrateful pagans seem to have been ignorant of this magnificent scheme in their favour; they too brand Stilicho with the name of traitor, and ascribe to his perfidious dealings with Alaric the final ruin of Rome.⁶ They hated him as the enemy, the despoiler of their religion; as having robbed the temples of their treasures, burned the Sibylline books, stripped from the doors of the Capitol the plates of gold. Stilicho knew the weakness as well as the strength of Rome; that may have been but wise and necessary policy, in order, by timely concession and tribute under the honourable name of boon or largess, to keep the formidable barbarian beyond the frontiers of Italy, which may have seemed treasonable degradation

⁵ Orosius, vii. 38

⁶ So Rutilius Numatianus, who hated Christianity—

"Quo magis est factinus dicit Stilichonis ini-
quum,
Proditor arcani qui fuit imperii.

Romano generi dum nititur esse super-
stes,

Crudelis summis miscuit ima furor.
Cumque timet, quicquid se fecerat ante
timere,
Immisit Latia: barbara tela nee "

Rutil. Itin. ii. 41.

to the haughty court, blind to its own impotence.^u The death of Stilicho was the signal for the reap-^{Alaric's second invasion.}pearance of Alaric again in arms in the centre of Italy. His pretext for this second invasion was the violation of the treaties entered into by Stilicho. At all events, the unanswerable testimony to the abilities of Stilicho, if not to his fidelity, is that which seemed to be the immediate, inevitable consequence of his disgrace and execution. No sooner was Stilicho dead, than Rome lay open to the barbarian conqueror. Unopposed, almost without a skirmish, laughing to scorn the slow and inefficient preparations of the emperor and of Olympius who ruled the emperor, and who had misguided him to the ruin of Stilicho, Alaric advanced from the Alps to the walls of Rome. The first act of defence adopted by the senate of Rome was the judicial murder of Serena, the widow of Stilicho. She was accused of a design to betray the city to the Goth. Both parties seem to have consented to this deed. The heathens remembered that when Theodosius the Great had struck the deadly blow against the rites and the temples of paganism, by prohibiting all public expenditure on heathen ceremonies, Serena had stripped a costly necklace from the statue of Rhea, the most ancient and venerable of Rome's goddesses, and herself ostentatiously worn the precious spoil; that neck was now given up to strangulation, a righteous and appropriate punishment for heimpiety. The historian seems to intimate^x that the Romans were surprised that the death of Serena produced no effect on the remorseless Goth. The siege^{Siege of Rome. A.D. 408.} of Rome was formed; the vast population, accustomed to live, the wealthy in luxury perhaps to no

^u Compare Gibbon, c. xxx.^x Zosimus—Sozomen, ix. 6.

great extent moderated by Christianity, the poor by gratuitous distributions at the expense of the public or of the rich, to which Christian charity had now come in aid,[†] were suddenly reduced to the worst extremities of famine. The public distributions were diminished to one half, to one third. The heaps of dead bodies, which there wanted space to bury, produced a pestilence. In vain the Senate endeavoured to negotiate an honourable capitulation. Alaric scorned alike their money, their despair, their pride. When they spoke of their immense population, he burst out into laughter,—“The thicker the hay, the easier it is mown.” On his demand of an exorbitant ransom, the Senate humbly inquired, “What, then, do you leave us?” “Your lives!” replied the insulting Goth.

During this first siege Innocent was in Rome. The strange story of the desperate proposition to deliver the city by the magical arts of certain Etruscan diviners, who had power, it was supposed, to call down and direct the lightnings of heaven, appears, in different forms, in the pagan and Christian historians.^{*} Innocent himself is said, by the heathen Zosimus, to have assented to the idolatrous ceremony. If this be true, it is possible that the mind of the Christian Prelate may have been so entirely unhinged by the terrors of the siege and the dreadful sufferings of the people, that he may have yielded to any hope, however wild, of averting the ruin. It is possible, though less probable, that he may have known or supposed the Etruscans to be possessed of some skilful, and in no way supernatural,

[†] Læta, the wife of Gratian, and her mother, were distinguished by their abundant charities, which at least mitigated the sufferings of multitudes.

^{*} Compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. 96. Zosimus, v. 41. Sozomen, ix. 6.

means of producing apparent wonders,^a which might awe the ignorant barbarians, and of which the use might be justified by the dreadful crisis; and if these arts were thought supernatural, it was not for him to expose, at least for the present, the useful delusion. At all events, to judge the conduct of Innocent, we must throw ourselves completely back into the terror and affliction, the confusion and prostration of that disastrous time. The whole history is obscure and contradictory. The Christian writer asserts that the ceremony did take place, but that the Christians (he does not name Innocent) stood aloof from the profane and ineffectual rite. The heathen aver, that the Senate, after grave deliberation, refused to sanction its public performance, and that, in fact, it did not take place. The barbarian, at length, condescended to accept a ransom, in ^{Capitulation.} some proportion to the wealth of the city—5000 pounds of gold, 30,000 of silver, four thousand silken robes, 3000 pieces of scarlet cloth, 3000 pounds of pepper. To make up the deficiency of the precious metals, the heathen temples, to the horror of that party, were despoiled; the time-honoured statues of gods were melted to make up the amount demanded by the barbarian. The last fatal sign and omen of the departure of Roman greatness was, that the statue of Fortitude, or Virtue, was thrown into the common mass.^b

Alaric retired from Rome, his army increased by multitudes of slaves from the city and the neighbour-

^a See Eusebe Salverte, on the knowledge possessed by the ancients in conducting lightning. — Sciences Occultes.

^b ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐχώνευσαν τινὰ τῶν ἐκ χυρσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου πεποιημένων, ὧν

ἦν καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀνδρίας, ἣν καλοῦσι μαῖοι Οὐριπούτεμ· οὐπερ διαφθάρειν ἔστα τῆς ἀνδρίας ἦν καὶ ἀρέτης παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἀπέσβη. . . Zosimus, v. 41.

hood, who, it is said, to the number of 40,000, had found refuge in his camp. The infatuated pride, the insincerity, the treachery of the court of Ravenna, rendered impracticable all negotiations for peace. The minister Olympius, the chief agent in the assassination of Stilicho, has found favour, of which he seems to have been utterly unworthy, from Christian writers, on account of some letters addressed to him by St. Augustine. Even his fall produced no great change. Honorius, indeed, seems to have occupied his time at this crisis in framing edicts against Jews and heretics, and other decrees, as if for a peaceful and extensive empire. Under Olympius, he had promulgated the Imperial rescript, which deprived the heathen temples of their last revenue; it was confiscated for the use of the devout soldiers. The statues of the gods were ordered to be thrown down; the temples in the cities were seized for public uses, others were to be destroyed; the banquets (*epulæ*) prohibited.^c But he was compelled to repeal a law which deprived him of the services of all heathens. Generides, a valiant and able pagan, was permitted to resume the military belt, and to take the command of part of the Imperial forces. A second time Alaric appeared before Rome. He seized upon the port of Ostia, and this cut off at once almost all the supplies of the city.^d Rome opened her gates, and Alaric set up a pageant emperor, Attalus, as a rival to the emperor in Ravenna. The Christians beheld the elevation of Attalus, a pagan, who submitted to Arian baptism, but openly attempted to

Attalus
Emperor.
A.D. 409.

^c This law is dated the 17th of the calends of December, 408. *Templorum detrahantur annonæ et rem annonariam jubent, expensis devotissimorum militum profuturæ, &c.* Compare Beugnot, u. p. 49, *et seqq.* Cod. Theodos. xvi. 10, 11.

^d As usual, the dealers in grain were accused of hoarding their stores, in order to possess themselves of all the remaining wealth of the city.

restore the party of paganism, with undisguised aversion. Lampadius, the Senator, at the head of this party, was Prætorian Præfect, Tertullus Consul. Tertullus boldly declared that to the Consulate he should add the High Priesthood.^e The Pagan historian describes the universal joy of Rome at the elevation of such just and noble magistrates. The Christians^f looked eagerly to the court of Ravenna. Alaric was encamped between the Christian and pagan cities, between Ravenna and Rome. The feeble government of Attalus had to encounter an enemy even more formidable than the Christians. The Count Heraclian closed the ports of Africa: a famine even more terrible than during the former siege, and even that had reduced men to the most loathsome and abominable food, afflicted the enfeebled and diminished population. A strange and revolting anecdote illustrates at once Roman manners and this dire calamity. The Romans, though they had no bread, had still their Circensian games. In the midst of the excitement, the ears of the Emperor were assailed with a wild cry—Fix the tariff for human flesh.^g All these calamities the Christians ascribed to the restoration of heathen rites.

Attalus, at the word of his Gothic master, descended from his throne, and sank back to his former insignificance. But Rome, when Alaric appeared a third time under her walls, prepared to close her gates, and to act on the defensive (the Emperor Honorius had received the scanty succour of six cohorts

^e Sozom. ix. 9. ^f Oros. vii. 42.

^g Zosimus inserts the words in Latin
--Pone pretium carni humanæ. The

price of bread, as of all other articles,
was fixed by the government. Zosimus

vi. 1.

from the East, and Rome was in frantic hope of rescue from Ravenna). Weakness or treachery baffled this desperate, if courageous, determination. At the dead of night, the Salarian gate was opened; the morning beheld Rome in the possession of the conqueror; but the conqueror, though a barbarian and a heretic, was a Christian. Over the fall of Rome, history might seem, in horror, to have dropped a veil.^b

However the first appalling intelligence of this event shook the Roman world to the centre, and the fearful scene of pillage, violation, and destruction by fire and sword, was imagined to surpass in its horrors everything recorded in profane or sacred history, yet the shock passed away; and Rome quietly assumed her second, her Christian empire. When the first stunning tidings of the fall of the Imperial City reached Jerome in his retirement in Palestine, even some time after, when he had held intercourse with fugitives from Rome, the capture represents itself to his vivid fancy as one dark and terrific mass of havoc and ruin. It was accompanied by no mitigating or relieving circumstances; by none of those striking incidents of Christian piety and mercy, which, in the pages of Augustine and Orosius, are thrown across the general gloom. The sudden horror, as well as consternation, joined with the gloomy temperament of Jerome to deepen the darkness of the scene.^c He asserts that the

^b Rome may be said to have fallen without an historian. Her ruin was indeed described by the Greek Zosimus, but his sixth book is lost. Orosius cannot be dignified by the name—his work is but a summary of Augustine's City of God.

^c *Terribilis de Occidente rumor affertur . . . —Hæret vox et singultus interceptum verba dictantis. Capitur urbs, quæ totum cepit orbem, imo fame perit, antequam gladio, et vix pauci, qui caperentur, inventi sunt. Epist. xciv. Marcellæ Epitaph. Yet,*

famine had already so thinned the population, that few remained in the city to be taken. He heaps together the awful passages in the Old Testament, on the capture of Jerusalem and other eastern cities, and the noble lines of Virgil on the sack of Troy, as but feebly descriptive of the night in which fell the Moab of the West. Nor can it be supposed that, whatever the disposition or even the orders of Alaric, the capture of a city so wealthy, so luxurious, so populous, by a vast and ill-disciplined host of barbarians, at least at their first irruption, could be more than a wild tumult of fury, licence, plunder, bloodshed, and conflagration. Multitudes of that host, no doubt, still held their old warlike Teutonic faith. In those who were called Christians the ferocity of the triumphant soldier was hardly mitigated by the softening influences of the Gospel. The forty thousand slaves said to have joined the army of Alaric, brought their revenge and their local and personal knowledge of the richest palaces, and of the most opulent families, which would furnish the most attractive victims to lust or to pillage. But the calamities that involved in ruin almost the whole pagan population and the palaces of the ancient families, which still adhered to their ancestral gods, are lost in oblivion; while Christianity has boastfully, or gratefully, preserved those exceptional incidents in which through her influence, and in her behalf, the common disaster was rebuked, checked, mitigated. The last feeble murmurs of paganism arraigned Christianity as the cause of the desertion of the city by her ancient and mighty

Extinction of
paganism.

in the same letter, he writes to Marcella—*Sic mihi fas audita loqui; imo a sanctis viris visa narrare, qui interfuerunt presentes.*—*Ibid.*

Nocte Moab capta est, nocte cecidit murus ejus. Hieronym. 1. 121. ad Principem

gods, and, therefore, of her inevitable fate. Christianity was now so completely the mistress of the human mind, as to assert that it was, indeed, the power of her God—her justly provoked and righteously avenging God—which had brought to its final close the Gentile sovereignty of Rome. Nothing pagan had escaped, but that which found shelter under Christianity. For Alaric, though an Arian, was a Christian. His conduct was strongly contrasted with what might have been feared from the heathen Rhadagaisus, if God had abandoned Rome to his fury. The Goth had been throughout under the awful control of Christianity.* He is said to have issued a proclamation, which, while it abandoned the guilty and luxurious city to plunder, commanded regard for human life; and especially the most religious respect for the Churches of the Apostles. In obedience to these commands, and under the especial control of the Almighty, among the smoking ruins, the plundered houses and temples, the families desolated by the sword, or by outrages worse than death, the Christian edifices alone commanded at least some reverence and security. Everywhere else was promiscuous massacre, peace and safety alone in the

Influence of
Christianity.

* The great Christian argument is summed up in this noble passage of Augustine:—

Quicquid igitur vastationis, trucidationis, depredationis, concriminationis, afflictionis in istâ recentissimâ Romanâ clade commissum est: facit hoc consuetudo bellorum. Quod autem more novo factum est, quod inusitatâ rerum facie immantitas barbara tam mitis apparuit, ut amplissimæ basilicæ im-

plendæ populo, cui parceretur, et gereretur et decerneretur, ubi neferneretur, unde nemo raperetur, quolibet liberandi multi a miserantibus hostibus duceantur, unde captivandi nulli, nec a ciudelibus hostibus abducerentur: hoc Christi nomini, hoc Christiano temporis tribuendum, quisquis non videt, cæcus; quisquis videt, nec laudat, ingratus; quisquis laudanti reluctatur, insanus est. *Augustin. Tract. de exid. Urbis.*

churches. The heathens themselves fled to these, the only places of refuge; they took shelter, in their terror and despair, under the altars which they despised or hated. The more solid and majestic structures of paganism would, no doubt, defy the injuries which might be wrought by barbarians, more intent on plunder than destruction, but their most hallowed sanctuaries were violated. Before the Christian Churches alone rapacity, and lust, and cruelty were arrested, and stood abashed. When the conflagration raged, as it did in some parts of the city, ~~amid~~ private houses, palaces, or temples, some of the ~~sacred~~ edifices of the Christians might be enveloped in the flames. But the more important churches—those of St. Peter and St. Paul—were respected by the spreading fires, as well as by the infuriated soldiery.^m There the obedient sword of the conqueror paused in its work of death, and even his cupidity was overawed.ⁿ Of all the temple treasures, the public or private hoards of precious metals, which the owners were compelled to betray by the most excruciating tortures, the jewels, the plate, the spoils of centuries of conquest, the accumulated plunder of provinces, only the sacred vessels and ornaments of Christian worship remained inviolate. It was said that sacred vessels found without the precincts of the Church were borne with reverential decency into the sanctuary. Of this Orosius relates a remarkable and particular history. A fierce soldier entered in quest of plunder into the dwelling of an aged Christian virgin. He demanded,

^m Augustin. de Civ. Dei, ii. 1. a. 7. Yet this was unknown to Jerome. He says, *In cineres ac favillas sacræ quondam ecclesiæ conciderunt.* Epist. xcii.

ⁿ Perhaps the remote and even extramural situation of these churches might tend to their security.

in courteous terms, the surrender of her treasures. She exposed to his view many vessels of gold, of great size, weight, and beauty; vessels of which the soldier knew neither the use nor name. "These," she said, "are the property of the Apostle St. Peter. Take them, if you dare, and answer for your act to God. A defenceless woman, I cannot protect them from your violence; my soul, therefore, is free from sin." The soldier stood awe-struck. A message was sent to Alaric, and orders were instantly despatched that the virgin and her holy treasures should be safely conducted to the Church of the Apostle. The procession (for the virgin's dwelling was far distant from the Church) was led through the long and wondering streets. The people broke out into hymns of adoration, and amid the tumult of disorder and ruin, the tranquil pomp pursued its course; the name of Christ rose swelling above the wild dissonance of the captured city. Even more lawless passions yielded to the holy control. In the loathsome scenes of violation, the chastity of Christian virgins alone—at least, in some instances—found respect from the lustful barbarian.* There is an instance of a beautiful virgin who thus preserved her honour. Indignant at her resistance, the young soldier into whose power she had fallen, drew his sword and slightly wounded her. Though bleeding, she calmly held out her neck to the stroke of death. The soldier, though an Arian, observes the Catholic writer, could not but admire her

Protection of
females.

* Demetrius escaped, according to St. Jerome. Dudum inter barbaras tremuisti manus; aviæ et matris sinu et pallis tegebaris. Vidisti te captivam, et pudicitiam tuam non tuæ potestatis: horruisti truces hostium vultus: raptas virgines Dei gemitu tacite conspexisti. Hieronym. Epist. 8. Compare Augustin de Civ. Dei, l. 16.

fidelity to Christ her spouse. He led her to the Church, and, with a gift of six pounds of gold, surrendered her to those who were on guard over the sanctuary.^p Marcella, the friend of Jerome, did not escape so easily the only dangers to which, on account of her age, she was exposed. As he had heard from eye-witnesses of the scene, it was not till she had been beaten and scourged,^q to compel her to reveal her secret treasures, treasures long before expended in charity, that her admirable courage and patience enforced the respect of the spoiler and induced him to lead her to the asylum of the Church of St. Paul.^r

^p Sozomen, H. E. ix. 10.

^q *Casam fustibus flagellisq;e, aiunt te non sensisse tormenta.* Hieronym. Epist. loc. cit.

^r The most extraordinary passage relating to the sack of Rome is in St. Jerome's next letter. All the horrors on which he has dwelt,—the capture of Rome, the massacre, rape, pillage, and conflagration,—are not merely *mitigated*, but amply *compensated* to Rome and to the world by the profession of virginity made by Demetrias. It was as great a triumph as the discomfiture of the Gothic army would have been. We can neither understand Jerome nor his age without considering these strange sentences. Her vows of chastity were against the wishes of her whole family; the greater, therefore, their merit. Hence "*invenisse eam quod præstaret generi, quod Romanæ urbis cineres mitigaret.*" After describing the rejoicing of Africa, he proceeds: *Tunc lugubres vestes Italia mu-*

tavit, et semirutæ urbis Romæ mania, pristinum in parte recipere fulgorem, propitium sibi existimantes Deum, sic alumnæ conversione perfectâ. Putares extinctam Gothorum manum, et coluvium perfugarum et servorum, Domini desuper intonantis tulmine cecidisse. Non sic post Trebiam, Thiasymenum, et Cannas, in quibus locis Romanorum exercituum cæsa sunt milia, Marcelli primum apud Nolam præho, se populus Romanus erexit, &c. &c. Jerome has some notion that he is surpassing Tully and Demosthenes, whose eloquence would be unequal to this wonderful event. Compare with this letter the Epistle addressed to the same Demetrias, there is little doubt, by no less a person than the heresiarch Pelagius. Pelagius, in the spirit of his age, is an admirer of virginity. But throughout the Epistle there is a singular calmness as well as elegance of style, which forcibly contrasts with the passionate hyperboles of Jerome.

Innocent was happily absent from Rome during the last siege and sack of the city. After the ^{Innocent absent from Rome.} second retreat of Alaric from before the walls, he had accompanied a deputation to Ravenna, to seek, and seek in vain, from the powerless Emperor, some protection for the capital. He did not return, and the fate of the city was left to the resolutions of the Senate. He thus escaped the horrors of that fatal night, and the three days' pillage of the city. If his presence did not contribute to the comparative security of the Christians, neither did his holy person endure the peril of exposure to insult, or the blind and indiscriminating fury of a heathen soldiery. Innocent returned to a city, if in some parts ruined and desolate, now entirely Christian; the ancient religion was buried under the ruins. Many of the noblest families of Rome were reduced to slavery by the Goths; some had anticipated the capture of the city by a shameful flight: many more abandoned for ever their doomed and hopeless country. Alaric, and his host, satiated with three days' plunder, at the end of six days broke up from Rome to ravage the rich and defenceless cities of southern Italy. The estates, which had so long maintained the enormous luxury of the Roman patricians, were ravaged or confiscated: whole families swept away into bondage. Without the city, as within, almost all that remained of eminent and famous names,

Pelagius, too, alludes to the sack of Rome, and urges it as an image of the last day. Eadem omnibus imago mortis, nisi quia magis eam timebant illi, quibus fuerat vita jucundior. Si ita mortales timemus hostes, et humanam manum, cum clangore terribili tuba intonare de cælo cœperit, &c. Oper. Hieronym. v. p. 29

the ancestral houses, which kept up the tradition of the glory of the republic, or the wealth of the Empire, sank into obscurity or total oblivion. The fugitives from Rome were found in all parts of the world,* and among these no doubt were almost all the more distinguished heathens,† who, no longer combining into a powerful party, no longer held together by the presence of the old ancestral temples, or by the household gods of their race and family, reduced to poor and insignificant outcasts from descendants and representatives of the noblest houses in Rome, gradually melted into the general Christian population of the empire. Those, whom Jerome beheld at Bethlehem, were doubtless Christians; but the whole coasts, not only of Italy and its islands, of Africa, Egypt, and the East, swarmed with these unfortunate exiles.‡ Carthage was full of those who, to the great indignation of Augustine, notwithstanding this visible sign of Almighty wrath, crowded the theatres, and raised turbulent factions concerning rival actors; they carried with them no doubt, and readily promulgated that hostile sentiment towards Christianity, which attributed all the calamities of the times, consummated in the sack of Rome, to the new religion. It was this last desperate

* Nulla est regio, quæ non exules Romanos habeat.—Hieronym. Epist. xcviil.

† Compare Prefat. ad Ezekiel.

‡ Honorius, in the mean time, was still issuing sanguinary edicts against heretics. Oraculo penitus remoto, quo ad ritus suos hærenæ superstitionis obrepserant, sciant omnes sanctæ legis inimici, plectendos se penâ et pro-

scriptionis et sanguinis, si ultra convenire per publicum execrandâ sceleris sui temeritate tentaverint. To this law, addressed to Heraclian, count of Africa, (Cod. Theodos. c. 51, de Hæret.) Baronius ascribes the speedy deliverance of the city from Alaric, so highly was it approved by God! Sub ann.

410.

remonstrance of paganism which called forth Augustine's City of God, and the brief and more lively perhaps, but meagre and superficial work of Orosius. Babylon has fallen, and fallen for ever; the City of God, at least the centre and stronghold of the City of God, is in Christian Rome.

Nor did Innocent return to rule over a desert. The wonder, which is expressed at the rapid restoration of Rome, shows that the general consternation and awe, at the tidings of the capture, had greatly exaggerated the amount both of damage and of depopulation. Some of the palaces of the nobles, who had fled from the city, or perished in the siege, may have remained in ruins; above all the temples, now without funds to repair them from their confiscated estates, from the alienated government, or from the munificence of wealthy worshippers, would be left exposed to every casual injury, and fall into irremediable dilapidation, unless seized and appropriated to its own uses by the triumphant faith. Now probably began the slow conversion of the heathen fanes into Christian churches.* It took many more sieges, many more irruptions of barbaric conquerors, to destroy the works of centuries in the capital of the world's wealth and power. If deserted temples were left to decay, churches rose; palaces found new lords; the humbler buildings, which are for the most part the prey of ruin and conflagration, are speedily repaired; it is hardly less labour to demolish than to build solid, massy and substantial

* In Rome this was rare, till the late conversion of the Pantheon into a Christian church. Few churches stand even on the sites of ancient temples. The Basilica seems to have been preferred for Christian worship.

habitations; and fire, which probably did not rage to any great extent, was the only destructive agent which, during Alaric's occupation, endangered the grandeur or majesty of the city.

If Christian Rome rose thus out of the ruin of the pagan city, the Bishop of Rome rose in proportionate grandeur above the wreck of the old institutions and scattered society. Saved, as doubtless it seemed, by the especial protection of God from all participation, even from the sight of this tremendous, this ignominious disaster, according to the phrase of the times, as Lot out of the fires of Sodom,⁷ he alone could lift up his head, if with sorrow without shame.

Greatness
of Bishop.

Honorius hid himself in Ravenna, nor did the Emperor ever again, for any long time, make his residence at Rome. With the religion expired all the venerable titles of the religion, the Great High Priests and Flamens, the Auspices and Augurs. On the Pontifical throne sat the Bishop of Rome, awaiting the time when he should ascend also the Imperial throne; or, at least, if without the name, possess the substance of the Imperial power, and stand almost as much above the shadowy form of the old republican dignities, which still retained their titles and some municipal authority, as the Cæsars themselves. The capture of Rome by Alaric was one of the great steps by which the Pope arose to his plenitude of power. There could be no question that from this time the greatest man in Rome was the Pope; he alone was invested with permanent and real power; he alone possessed all the attributes of supremacy, the reverence, it was his own fault, if not the love of the people. He had a sacred indefeasible

A.D. 411.

title ; authority unlimited, because undefined ; wealth, which none dared to usurp, which multitudes lavishly contributed to increase by free-will offerings ; he is, in one sense, a Cæsar, whose apotheosis has taken place in his lifetime, environed by his Prætorian guards, his ecclesiastics, on whose fidelity and obedience he may, when once seated on the throne, implicitly rely ; whose edicts are gradually received as law ; and who has his spiritual Prætors and Proconsuls in almost every part of Western Christendom.

CHAPTER II.

Pelagianism.

THE Pelagian question agitated the West during the later years of Innocent's pontificate. This has ^{Pelagian} been the great interminable controversy of ^{controversy.} Latin, of more than Latin, of all Western Christianity. The nature of the Godhead and of the Christ was the problem of the speculative East: that of man, his state after the fall, the freedom or bondage of his will, the motive principle of his actions, that of the more active West. The East might seem to dismiss this whole dispute with almost contemptuous indifference. Though Pelagius himself, and his follower Celestius, visited Palestine and obtained the suffrages of a provincial council in their favour; though from his cell near Bethlehem, Jerome mingled in the fray with all his native violence,—there the controversy died rapidly away, leaving hardly a record in Grecian theology, none whatever in Greek ecclesiastical history.*

So completely, however, throughout the Roman world is Christianity now an important part of ^{Pelagius.} human affairs, as to become a means of intercourse and communication between the remotest provinces. On the one hand new, and, as they are

* Walch has observed, that none of ^{lagian controversy.} *Ketzer-Geschichte*, the Greek historians, neither Socrates, *iv.* p. 531. Sozomen, nor Theodoret, notice the Pe-

esteemed, heretical opinions are propagated, usually by their authors or by their partisans, from the most distant quarters, and so spread throughout Christendom ; on the other hand, the Christian world is leagued together in every part to suppress these proscribed opinions. A Briton, Pelagius, by some accounts two Britons, Pelagius and Celestius, leave their home at the extremity of the known earth, perhaps the borders of Wales, the uttermost part of Britain, to disturb the whole Christian world. Pelagius is said to have been a monk, and though no doubt bound by vows of celibacy, yet was under the discipline of no community. He arrives in Rome, from Rome he passes to Africa, from Africa to Palestine. Everywhere he preaches his doctrines, obtains proselytes, or is opposed by inflexible adversaries. The fervid religion of the African Churches repudiated with one voice the colder and more philosophic reasonings of Pelagius :^b they submitted to the ascendancy of Augustine, and threw themselves into his views with all their unextinguishable ardour.

But in the East the glowing writings of Augustine were not understood, probably not known ;^c his predestinarian notions never seem to have been congenial to the Christianity of the Greeks. In Palestine, however, Pelagius was encountered by two

Pelagius in
the East.

My history of the earlier period of Christianity entered into the general character of Pelagianism, especially as connected with the character and writings of Augustine. I consider it at present chiefly in its relation to Latin Christianity.—H.st. of Christianity, in. pp. 171, 177.

^c Except by Jerome, who, however, received his writings irregularly and with much delay.—The ordinary correspondence between the provinces seems now to have been slow and precarious. Nothing, writes Augustine to Jerome, grieves me so much as your distance from me—"ut vix possim meas dare, vel recipere tuas litteras, per intervalla non dierum, non mensium, sed aliquot annorum."—August. Epist. xxviii. Were any of his works translated into Greek ?

implacable adversaries, Heros and Lazarus, bishops of Gaul.^d It is probable, indeed, that the persecution was to be traced to the cell of Jerome,^e with whose vehement and superstitious temperament his doctrines clashed as violently as with those of Augustine. Pelagius was arraigned before a synod of fourteen prelates, ^{Council of} at Diospolis (the ancient Lydda). and, to the ^{Diospolis.} astonishment and discomfiture of his adversaries, solemnly acquitted of all heretical tenets. It is asserted that the fathers of Diospolis were imposed upon by the subtle and plausible dialectics of Pelagius. Considering, indeed, that his accusers, the Gallic bishops (neither of whom personally appeared), and his third adversary, Orosius, the friend and disciple of Augustine, only spoke Latin, that the Palestinian bishops only understood Greek (perhaps imperfectly any language but their own vernacular Syrian), and that Pelagius had the command of both languages; that these questions, which demanded the most exquisite nicety of expression and the

^d Orosius too was in Palestine, it should seem, in search of relics. He had the good fortune to carry off the body of the proto-martyr St. Stephen. Compare Baronius, sub ann.

^e The letter to Demetrius, in the works of St. Jerome, seems admitted to be a genuine writing of Pelagius. That both Pelagius and his antagonist Jerome should have addressed an epistle to the same Demetrius suggests the suspicion of some strong personal rivalry. They were striving, as it were, for the command of this distinguished and still probably wealthy female.

The whole tenor of the letter of Pelagius confirms the position, that

the opinions of Pelagius had no connexion with monastic enthusiasm, and did not arise out of that pride "of good works" which may belong to the consciousness of extraordinary austerities. (Compare Neander, *Christliche Kirche*.) Pelagius arrives at his conclusions by a calm, it might seem cold, philosophy. Excepting as to the praise of virginity, the greater part of the letter might have been written by an ancient Academic, or by a modern metaphysical inquirer. Jerome traces the origin of Pelagianism to the Greek, particularly the Stoic philosophy. He quotes Tertullian's saying, *Philosophi patriarchæ hæreticorum*.—*Pieronym* Epist. ad Ctesiphont.

strictest accuracy of definition, must have been carried on by the clumsy means of interpreters,—the council of Diospolis, to the dispassionate inquirer, cannot carry much weight. The usual consequences of religious controversies in those days, and in those regions, were not slow to appear. Jerome was attacked in his retirement, his disciples maltreated by their triumphant adversaries. Pelagius himself seems entirely exempted from any concurrence in these lawless proceedings; but his fanatic followers (and even his calm tenets in the East could for once kindle fanaticism) are accused of perpetrating every crime, pillage, murder, conflagration on the peaceful disciples of Jerome, especially on some of the noble Roman ladies who shared his solitude.¹

While ignorance, or indifference, or chance, or personal hostility to the asserters of anti-Pelagian opinions decided the question in the East, the West demanded a more solemn and authoritative adjudication on this absorbing controversy. By the decrees of the Council of Diospolis, Africa and the East were at direct issue; and where should the Africans seek the arbiter, or the

¹ Innocent Epist. ad Aurel. et ad Johannem, Episcop. Hierosolym. These revengeful violences against Jerome appear to me better evidence that he was at least supposed to be the head of the faction opposed to Pelagius, than the reasons alleged by P. Daniel, Hist. du Concile de Palestine, and Walch, p. 398. The strong expressions as to these acts are from Innocent's letter. *Direptiones, caedes, incendia, omne facinus extremæ dementiæ, generosissimæ sanctæ virgines deploraverunt in locis ecclesiæ tuæ perpetuasse diabolum, nomen enim hominis causamque retulerunt.*—Apud Labbe, Concl., ii. p.

1315. If the odious Pelagius had been the man, they would hardly have suppressed his name. And it must be acknowledged that Jerome suffered only the natural results of his own principles. In his third dialogue against the Pelagians he introduces their advocate as scarcely daring to speak out, lest he should be stoned: *Statim in me populorum lapides conicias, et quem viribus non potes, voluntate interficias.* To this the Catholic rejoins, *Ille hæreticum interficit, qui hæreticum esse patitur.*—Hieronym. Oper., iv. 2. p. 544.

powerful defender of their opinions, but at Rome? Constantinople, and Alexandria, and Antioch. took no interest in these questions, or were occupied, especially the two former, by their own religious and political quarrels. The African Church, when such a cause was on the issue, stood not on her independence. As a Western monk, Pelagius was amenable, in some degree, to the patriarchal authority of the Bishop of Rome. Both parties seemed at least to acquiesce in the appeal to Innocent: the event could not be doubtful in such an age and before the representative of Latin Christianity.

All great divergencies of religion, where men are really religious (and this seems acknowledged as to Pelagius himself, and still more as to some of his semi-Pelagian followers, Julianus of Eclana and the Monastic Cassian), arise from the undue dominance of some principle or element in our religious nature. This controversy was in truth the strife between two such innate principles, which philosophy despairs of reconciling, and on which the New Testament has not pronounced with clearness or precision. The religious sentiment, which ever assumes to itself the exclusive name and authority of religion, is not content without feeling, or at least supposing itself to feel, the direct, immediate agency of God upon the soul of man. This seems inseparable from the Divine Sovereignty, even from Providential government, which it looks like impiety to limit, and of which it is hard to conceive the self-limitation.⁸ Must not God's grace, of its nature, be irresistible? What can bound or fetter Omnipotence?

⁸ The absolute abandonment of free will seems the highest point of true devotion. Prosper thus writes of Augustine:—

"Et dum nullo sibi tribuit bona, fit Deus
omnium
Omnia, et in sancto regnat Sapientia
templo."

This seems the first principle admitted in prayer, in all intercourse between the soul of man and the Infinite : it is the life-spring of religious enthusiasm, the vital energy, not of fanaticism only, but of zeal.^h On the other hand, there is an equally intuitive consciousness (and out of consciousness grows all our knowledge of these things) of the freedom, or self-determining power, of the human will. On this depends all morality, and the sense of human responsibility ; all conception, except that which is unreasoning and instinctive, of the divine justice and mercy. This is the problem of philosophy ; the degree of subservience in the human will to influences external to itself, and in no way self-originated or self-controlled, and to its inward self-determining power.ⁱ In Christianity it involved not merely the metaphysic nature, but the whole biblical history of man ; the fall, and the sin inherited by the race of Adam ; the redemption of Christ, and the righteousness communicated to mankind by Christ.

Pelagius came too early for any calm consideration of his doctrines, or any attempt to reconcile the difficulties which he suggested, with the sacred writings. In his age the religious sentiment was at its height, and to the religious sentiment that system was true which brought the soul most strongly and immediately under divine agency. To substitute a law for that direct agency, to interpose in any way between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man, was impiety, blasphemy, a degradation of God and of his sole sovereignty. This sentiment was at its height in Western Christendom.

^h Compare this argument in another form. *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. p. 174.

Edwards on the Will throughoutⁱ which on this point coincides with the philosophy of Hume.

In no part had it grown to a passion so overwhelming as in Africa, in no African mind to such absorbing energy as in that of Augustine.

Augustine, after the death of Ambrose, ~~was~~ ^{St. Augustine} the one great authority in Latin Theology: from him was now anxiously expected, if it had not ~~dis-~~ ^{appeared}, the great work which was to silence the last desperate remonstrances of Paganism, the City of God.^k His Confessions had become at once the manual of passionate devotion, and the history of the internal struggle of sin and grace in the soul of man. Augustine had maintained great influence at the court of Ravenna: of the ministers of Honorius some were his personal friends, others courted his correspondence. Africa, the only granary, held the power of life and death over Italy: and political and religious interests were now inseparably moulded together. But it was probably not so much either the authority or the influence of Augustine, which swayed the mind of Innocent to establish the Augustinian theology as the theory of Western Christianity; it was rather its full coincidence with his own views of Christian truth.

Augustinianism was not merely the expression of the universal Christianity of the age as administering to, as being in itself the more full, fervent, continuous excitement of the religious sentiment, it was also closely allied with the two great characteristic tendencies of Latin Christianity.

Latin Christianity, in its strong sacerdotal system, in its rigid and exclusive theory of the church, ^{Latin Christianity anti-Pelagian.} at once admitted and mitigated the more repulsive parts of the Augustinian theology. Predestin-

^k On the City of God compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. p. 185, 187.

arianism itself, to those at least within the pale, lost much of its awful terrors. The Church was
 Causes. the predestined assemblage of those to whom and to whom alone, salvation was possible; the Church scrupled not to surrender the rest of mankind to that inexorable damnation entailed upon the human race by the sin of their first parents. As the Church, by the jealous exclusion of all heretics, drew around itself a narrower circle; this startling limitation of the divine mercies was compensated by the great-extension of its borders, which now comprehended all other baptized Christians. The only point in this theory at which human nature uttered a feeble remonstrance^m was the abandonment of infants, who never knew the distinction between good and evil, to eternal fires. The heart of Augustine wrung from his reluctant reason, which trembled at its own inconsistency, a milder damnation in their favour. But some of his more remorseless disciples disclaimed the illogical softness of their master.ⁿ

Through the Church alone, and so through the hier-
 Sacerdotal system. archy alone, man could be secure of that direct agency of God upon his soul, after which it yearned with irrepressible solicitude. The will of man

^m Julianus of Eclana put well the insuperable difficulty which has constantly revolted the human mind, when not under the spell of some absorbing religious excitement, against the extreme theory of Augustine and of Calvin. Deus, ais, ipse qui commendat caritatem suam in nobis, qui dilexit nos, et filio suo non peperit, sed pro nobis illum tradidit, ipse sic judicat, ipse est nascentium persecutor, ipse pro palâ voluntate æternis ignibus pau-

los tradit, quos nec bonam nec malam voluntatem scit habere potuisse.—Apud Augustin. Oper. Imperf. i. 48. Augustine struggles in vain to elude the difficulty. Julianus as well as Pelagius himself strenuously asserted the necessity of infant baptism, not however as giving remission of sins, but as admitting to Christian privileges and blessings.

ⁿ Compare Hist. of Christ., iii. 174, note, and quotation from Fulgentius.

surrendered itself to the clergy, for on them depended its slavery or its emancipation, as far as it was capable of emancipation. In the clergy, divine grace, the patrimony of the Church, was vested, and through them distributed to mankind. Baptism, usually administered by them alone, washed away original sin; the other rites and sacraments of which they were the exclusive ministers, were still conveying, and alone conveying, the influences of the Holy Ghost to the more or less passive soul. This objective and visible form as it were, which was assumed for the inward workings of God upon the mind and heart, by the certitude and security which it seemed to bestow, was so unspeakably consolatory, and relieved, especially the less reflective mind, from so much doubt and anxiety, that mankind was disposed to hail with gladness rather than examine with jealous suspicion these claims of the hierarchy. Thus the Augustinian theology coincided with the tendencies of the age towards the growth of the strong sacerdotal system; and the sacerdotal system reconciled Christendom with the Augustinian theology. But the invariable progress of the human mind, as to this question, is in itself remarkable; and necessary for the full comprehension of Christian history. All established religions subside into Pelagianism, or at least semi-Pelagianism. The interposition of the priest, or the sacrament, or of both, between the direct agency of God and the soul of man, for its own purposes, gradually admits a growing freedom of the will. Conformity to outward rites, obedience to orders or admonitions, every religious act is required on the one hand, as within the self-determining power of the will, and is in itself a more and more conscious exertion of that power. The sacerdotal system, in order that it may censure with more awful-

ness, and incite with more persuasiveness, admits a greater spontaneity of resistance to evil, and of inclination to good. It emancipates to a certain extent, that it may rule with a more absolute control. And as it was with Pelagius, so it is with his followers. No Pelagian ever has or ever will work a religious revolution. He who is destined for such a work must have a full conviction that God is acting directly, immediately, consciously, and therefore with irresistible power, upon him and through him. It is because he believes himself, and others believe him to be thus acted upon, that he has the burning courage to undertake, the indomitable perseverance to maintain, the inflexible resolution to die for his religion; so soon as that conviction is deadened, his power is gone. Men no longer acknowledge his mission, he himself has traitorously or timidly abandoned his mission. The voice of God is no longer speaking in his heart; men no longer recognise the voice of God from his lips. The prophet, the inspired teacher, the all but apostle, has now sunk to an ordinary believer. He who is not predestined, who does not declare, who does not believe himself predestined as the author of a great religious movement, he in whom God is not manifestly, sensibly, avowedly working out his pre-established designs, will never be Saint or Reformer.

But there was another part of the Augustinian theology, which has quietly dropped from it in all its later revivals, yet in his day was an integral, almost the leading doctrine of the system; and falling in, as it did, with the dominant feelings of Christendom, contributed powerfully to its establishment, as the religion of the Church. Augustine was not content to assert original sin, in the strongest language, against Pelagius, but did not scruple to dogmatize as to

The Transmission of original sin.

the mode of its transmission. This was by sexual intercourse,^o which he asserts in arguments, which the modesty of our present manners will not permit us to discuss, would have been unknown but for the Fall; and was in itself essentially evil,^p though an evil to be tolerated in the regenerate, for the procreation of children, themselves to be regenerate.^q

Thus this great Oriental principle of the inherent evil of matter, as we have seen in the course of our Christian history, was the dominant and fundamental tenet of Gnosticism, lay at the root of Arianism, and will hereafter appear as the remote parent of Nestorianism; and this was the primary axiom of all Monasticism, and so

^o The whole argument of the Book de Concupiscentia et de Nuptiis. Intentio igitur hujus libri est ut . . . carnalis concupiscentiæ malum, propter quod homo qui per eam nascitur, trahit originale peccatum, discernamus a bonitate nuptiarum.

^p Sed quia sine illo malo (carnalis concupiscentiæ) fieri non potest nuptiarum bonum, hoc est propagatio filiorum, ubi ad hujusmodi opus venit, secreta quærentur. Hinc est quod infantes etiam, qui peccare non possunt, non tamen sine peccati contagione nascuntur, non ex hoc quod licet, sed ex hoc quod dedecet. — De Peccat. Origin., c. xxvii. His standing argument is from natural modesty, which he confounds with the shame of conscious guilt.

^q The doctrine of original sin, as it is explicated by St. Austin, had two parents; one was the doctrine of the Encratites and some other heretics, who forbade marriage, and supposing it to be evil, thought that they were

warranted to say it was the bed of sin, and children the spawn of vipers and sinners; and St. Austin himself, and especially St. Hierome, speaks some things of marriage, which if they were true, then marriage were highly to be refused, as being the increaser of sin rather than of children, and a semination in the flesh and contrary to the spirit; and such a thing, which being mingled with sin, produces univocal issues; the mother and the daughter are so alike that they are worse again. — Jer. Taylor, Answer to a Letter.

This is thus stated by Julius Müller. *Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, ii. p. 525. Wir sind dabei durchaus nicht veranlasst die sinnliche Geschlechts-gemeinschaft als etwas an sich Sündhaften zu verstehen, welche sich Augustinus von der *concupiscentia* als der Strafe des Sündersfalls gebildet, und durch sein Ansehen in die scholastische und zum Theil in die Protestantische Theologie fort gepflanzt hat.

became, almost imperceptibly, the first recognised principle of all Latin theology. Augustine, in this theory of the transmission of sin, betrays that invincible horror of the intrinsic evil of the material and corporeal, which had been infused into his mind by his youthful Manicheism.^r Most of the other leading tenets of the Manicheans, the creation of man by the antagonistic malignant power, the unreality of the Christ, the whole mystic mythology of the imaginative Orientals, Augustine had rejected with indignation, and with the practical wisdom of the West; but, notwithstanding all his concessions on the dignity of marriage, he is, in this respect, an irreclaimable Manichean. Sin and all sensual indulgence, as it was called, all, however lawful, union between the sexes, were convertible terms, or terms so associated in human thought as to require some vigour of mind to discriminate between them. It was the vice of the theology of this period, and not, perhaps, of this period alone, that it seemed to make the indulgence of one passion almost the sole unchristian sin; a passion which is probably strengthened rather than suppressed by compelling the mind to dwell perpetually upon it. This (and on this the whole stress was laid throughout the controversy) was, the concupiscence of the flesh, inherited from Adam, which was not washed away in the sanctifying waters of baptism, but still clung to the material nature of man, and was to be kept under control only by the most rigid asceticism. Celibacy thus became not merely a hard duty, but a glorious distinction: the clergy, and those females who aspired to more perfect Christianity, not merely chose a

^r Augustine strongly protests against himself against him of Manicheism.—*De Con-*
the charge which was even then made | *cup. et Nupt.*, lib. ii.

more difficult, and therefore, if successful, a more noble career—but were raised far above those lower mortals, who, in the most legitimate and holy form, that of faithful marriage, submitted to be the parents of children.

Pelagius himself,^a so completely was the human mind possessed with this notion, almost rivalled Augustine in his praises of virginity, which he considered the great test of that strength of free will which he asserted to be weakened only, if weakened, by the fall of Adam.

The Augustinian theology, exactly to the extent to which it coincided with Latin Christianity, would no doubt harmonize with the opinions of one so ^{Innocent Augustinian,} completely representing that Christianity as ^{417. Jan. 27.} Innocent I. When the African Churches, in their councils at Carthage, and at Milevis in Numidia, addressed the Pontiff on this momentous subject, the character, as well as the station of Innocent, might command more than respectful deterence. Had they felt any jealousy as to their own independence, under the absorbing passion, the hatred of Pelagianism, they would have made any sacrifice to obtain the concurrence of the Bishop of Rome. The letters inform Innocent that the Africans had renewed the unregarded anathema pronounced against this wicked error, especially of Celestius, which had been issued five years before. They assert the power of Innocent to summon Pelagius to Rome to answer for his guilt, and to exclude him from the communion of the faithful.^c They implore the dignity of the Apostolic throne, of the successor of

^a Epist. ad Demetriad.

| terrogandus.—Epist. Conc. Milev

^c Aut ergo a tuâ veneratione scerendus est Romam, et diligente in-

Labbe, ii., p. 1547.

St. Peter, to complete and ratify that which is wanting to their more moderate power.^u Pelagius himself, even if he did not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the tribunal, endeavoured to propitiate the favour of the judge: he addressed an explanatory letter, and a profession of faith, to the Bishop of Rome.^x

Yet Augustine and the Africans were not without solicitude as to the decision of Innocent. Since Pelagius, they knew, lived in Rome, undisturbed by the inquisitive zeal of the bishop, Augustine, in a private letter, signed by himself and four bishops, informed the Pope that some of these persons boasted that they had won him to their cause, or, at least, to think less unfavourably of Pelagius.^y

The answer of Innocent allayed their fears. He did not pass by the opportunity of asserting, as an acknowledged maxim, the dignity of the Apostolic See, the source of all episcopacy, and the advantage of an appeal to a tribunal, which might legislate for all Christendom.^z On the Pelagian question he places himself on the broad, popular, and unanswerable ground, that all Christian devotion implies the assistance of divine grace; that it is admitted in every response of the service, in every act of worship. He pronounces the opinions anathematised by the African bishops to be

^u Ut statutis nostræ mediocritatis, etiam apostolicæ sedis adhibeatur auctoritas, pro tuendâ salute multorum et quorundam etiam perversitate corrigendâ.—Epist. Conc. Carthag. ad Innocent. Labbe, ii. p. 1514.

^x Augustin. de Giat. Christ., cap. 30. De Pecc. Origin., 17, 21, &c.

^y Quidam scilicet quia vos talia persuasisse perhibent.—Ibid.

^z Qui ad nostrum referendum approbastis esse judicium, scientes quid Apostolicæ sedi (cum omnes hoc loco positi ipsum sequi desideremus Apostolum) debeat, a quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emerit.—Innocent. Epist. ad Episc. Afric.

Ut per cunctas orbis totius ecclesias, quod omnibus prosit, decernendum esse deposcitis.—Ibid.

heretical ; and declares that the unsound limb **must** be severed without remorse, lest it should infect the living body.* Africa, and all those who held the opinions of Augustine, triumphed in what might seem the unqualified sentence of the Bishop of Rome. At this period in the controversy, and before the arrival of the letter from Pelagius, died Pope Innocent I.

Death of
Innocent.
A.D. 417.
March 12.

So far the Bishop of Rome had floated onwards towards supremacy on the full tide of dominant opinion ; his decrees were so acceptable to the general ear, that the tone of authority in which they began to be couched, jarred not on any quivering chord of jealousy or suspicion. The secret of that power lay in Rome's complete impregnation with the spirit of the age ; and this lasted, almost unbroken, till the Reformation. It were neither just nor true to call this worldly policy, or to suppose that the Bishops of Rome dishonestly conformed, or bent their opinions to their age for the sake of aggrandising their power. Their sympathy with the general mind of Christianity constituted their strength ; from their conscious strength grew up, no doubt, their bolder spirit of domination ; but they became masters of the Western Church by being the representative, the centre, of its feelings and opinions. It was not till a much later period that the claim to personal infallibility, to the sole dictatorship over the Christianity of the world, was either advanced or thought necessary ; the present infallibility was but the expression of the

* The lines of Prosper, who has written a long poem on this abstruse subject, have been referred to this decree of Innocent I. :—

"In causam fidei flagrantius Africa nostra
Exequeris ; tecumque suum jungente
vigorem
Juris Apostolici solito, fera viscera belli
Conficis, et lato prosternis limite victor."

universal, or at least predominant sentiment of mankind.

Once at this period, and but for a short time, the Bishop of Rome threw himself directly across the stream of religious opinion. Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was by birth a Greek,^b and seemed disposed to treat the momentous questions agitated by the Pelagian controversy with the contemptuous indifference of a Greek. Whether from this uncongeniality of the Eastern mind with these debates; whether from the pride of the man, which was flattered by the submission of both these dangerous heresiarchs to his authority; whether from an earnest and well-intentioned, but mistaken hope, of suppressing what appeared to him a needless dispute, Zosimus annulled at one blow all the judgements of his predecessor, Innocent; and absolved the men, whom Innocent, if he had not branded with a direct anathema, had declared deserving to be cut off from the communion of the faithful.

The address of Pelagius to Innocent had not arrived in Rome before the death of that prelate; it was accompanied with a creed elaborately and ostentatiously orthodox on all the questions which agitated the Eastern mind, and a solemn and minute repudiation of all the heresies relating to the nature of the Godhead. It might seem almost prophetically intended to propitiate the favour of a Greek Pope. He touched but briefly on the freedom of the will, and the necessity of divine grace; rejecting, as Manichean, the doctrine, that sin was inevitable; as a doctrine which he ascribes to Jovinian, the impeccability of the Christian.^c Celestius,

^b Anastasius Bibliothec., c. 42.

^c The creed apud Baronium—sub an. 417—*Liberum sic esse confitemur* arbitrium, ut dicamus nos semper Dei indigere auxilio, et tam illos eriare qui cum *Manicheis* dicunt hominem peccata-

who had remained some time in peaceful retirement at Ephesus, had passed to Constantinople; from thence he is said to have been expelled by the Bishop Acacius. He now appeared in Rome, and throwing himself, as it were, at the feet of the Pontiff, declared that he was ready to submit to a dispassionate examination and authoritative judgement on his tenets.

A solemn hearing was appointed in the Basilica of St. Clement. Celestius was listened to with favour; if the positive sentence was delayed, his accusers Pelagius and Celestius declared orthodox. Heros and Lazarus, the Gallic bishops, were denounced in the strongest terms to the African Council as vagabond, turbulent, and intriguing prelates, who had either abdicated or abandoned their sees, and travelled about sowing strife and calumny wherever they went.^d The African prelates were summoned within a short period to make good their charges against Celestius, who in this first investigation had appeared unimpeachable.^e Zosimus went further: he had warned Celestius and his accusers alike to abstain from these idle questions and unedifying disputes, the offspring of vain curiosity, and of the desire for the display of eloquence on subjects unrevealed.^f Such to

tum vitare non posse, quam illos qui cum Joviniano asserunt, hominem non posse peccare: uterque enim tollit libertatem arbitrii.—Was the first clause aimed at Augustine and the Africans?

^d Zosimus Aurelio et univ. Episcop. Africæ.—Apud Labbe, ii., 1559.

Heros, according to Zosimus, had been Bishop of Aries, Lazarus of Aix. Their rise was owing entirely to the tyrant (probably the usurper Constan-

tine); it was accompanied with tumult and bloodshed, persecution of the priesthood who opposed them. With Constantinian they fell, driven out by the execrations of the people, and abdicating their sees.—So the Bishop of Rome. S. Prosper gives a high character of both.—S. Prosper, Chron.

• Innotescere sanctitati vestræ super absoluta Cœlestii fide nostrum examen.—Ibid.

^f Admoneri, has tendiculas quæ-

Zosimus appeared these questions, which had wrought Africa into a frenzy of zeal and distracted the whole

West. The trial of Celestius was followed by
Sept. 21.

the public recital of a letter from Praylas, Bishop of Jerusalem, asserting in the most unqualified terms the orthodoxy of Pelagius. It was read with joy, with admiration, almost with tears of delight. "Would," writes Zosimus to the African bishops, "that one of you had been present at the edifying scene. That such a man should be impeached, and impeached by a Heros and a Lazarus! There was no point in which the grace and assistance of God could be asserted by a faithful Christian, which was not fully acknowledged by them." §

But the authority, which was received with deferential homage, so long as it concurred with their own views, lost its magic directly that it espoused the opposite cause. The African bishops inflexibly adhered to the condemnation of Pelagius, of Celestius, and their doctrines. Carthage obstinately refused to yield to Rome; it appealed to the sentence of Innocent, and disdainfully rejected the annulling power of Zosimus. Augustine, indeed, continued to speak with conciliating mildness of the Roman Prelate; but he let fall some alarming and significant expressions as to the prevarication of the whole Roman clergy.

To the long representation addressed to him by the Council of Carthage, Zosimus replied in a
Council of Carthage, March, 418. haughty tone, asserting that, according to the tradition, no one might dare to dispute the judgement of

tionum, et inepta certamina quæ non edificant, sed magis destruunt, ex illâ curiositatis contagione profluere, dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentiâ supra scripta abutitur.—Ibid.

§ Tales enim absolutæ fidei infamari posse? Est ne ullus locus in quo Dei gratia vel adjutorium prætermittitur? Zosim. ad Episcop. Afric. Labbe, ii. p. 1561.

the Apostolic See. But the close of the epistle betrayed his embarrassment. Whether his natural sagacity had discovered that he had rashly attempted to stem the torrent of opinion; his brotherly love for the African Churches would induce him to communicate all his determinations to them, in order that they might act together for the common good of Christendom. He had stayed, therefore, all further proceedings in the affair of Celestius.^h

It was time for Zosimus to retrace his precipitate course. Augustine and the African bishops had summoned to their aid a more powerful ally than even the Bishop of Rome. While the Pope either still adhered to the cause of Pelagius, or but began to vacillate, an Imperial edict was issued from the court of Ravenna, peremptorily deciding on this abstruse question of theology.ⁱ This law was issued before the final sitting of the Council of Carthage, in which, on the authority of two hundred and twenty-three bishops, eight canons were passed, condemnatory of Pelagianism. There can be no doubt, that the law was obtained by the influence of the African bishops with the Emperor or his ministers; there is great likelihood by the personal authority of Augustine with the Count Valerius. Italy, indeed, could hardly refuse to listen to the voice of Africa. This appeal to the civil magistrate is but another instance, that the ecclesiastical power has no scruple in employing in its own favour those arms of which it deprecates the use, the employment of which it treats as impious usurpation, when put forth against it. By this law it became

Appeal to
the Emperor.

^h Zosim. ad Episcop. Africæ.

The law is dated April 30, A.D.

418. The final council was held early in May.

a crime against the state, to be visited with civil penalties, to assert that Adam was born liable to death.^k The dangerous heresiarchs were condemned by name, and without hearing or trial, to banishment from Rome.^m Informers were invited or commanded to apprehend and drag before the tribunals, and to accuse the maintainers of these wicked doctrines. In the order issued by the Prætorian Prefects of Italy and the East, to carry this law into effect, not merely were the heresiarchs banished, but their accomplices condemned to the confiscation of their estates, and to perpetual exile.ⁿ

Zosimus threw off the dangerous tenderness with which he had hitherto treated Celestius and his party. Already, before the promulgation of the Imperial edict, he had demanded his unequivocal condemnation of certain errors, charged against him by Paulinus, a Carthaginian deacon, who had been sent to Rome to represent the African opinions. Celestius was now again summoned to render an account of his tenets; under the ban of the Imperial law, an object of hatred to the populace, certain that the Pope had withdrawn his protection, of course he dared not appear; he had quietly retired from Rome.^o Zosimus proceeded to condemn the faith, to anathematise the doctrines of

Zosimus
retracts.

^k Hi patienti cunctorum Deo . . . tam trucem inclementiam sævæ voluntatis assignant . . . ut mortem præmitteret nascituro (Adamo, sc.), non hanc insidiis vetiti fluxisse peccati, sed exegisse penitus legem immutabilis constituti. —Rescript. Honor. et Theodos. apud Augustin. Oper. x., Append., p. 106.

^m Hos ergo repertos ubicunque de hoc tam nefando scelere conferentes a quibuscunque jubemus corripri, de-

ductosque ad audientiam publicam promiscuè ab omnibus accusari . . . ipsis innoxorati exili deportationi damnatis.—Ibid.

ⁿ The convicted heretic, by the edict of Palladius, was to be facultatum publicatione nudatus.

^o Augustin. de Pecc. Origin., c. 6 The gratulatory letter of Paulinus himself on the condemnation of Celestius in Baronius, sub ann. 418

Pelagius and Celestius, to excommunicate them from the body of the faithful, if they did not renounce and abjure the venomous tenets of their impious and abominable sect. Nor was this all: the Bishop of Rome addressed a circular letter to all the bishops of Christendom, condemning the doctrines of Pelagius. To this anathema they were expected to subscribe.^p

Eighteen bishops alone, of those who took this letter into consideration, refused to condemn their fellow Christians unheard. They turned ^{Eighteen} recusants, against Zosimus his own language to the African bishops, in which he had accused their precipitancy and injustice in condemning these very men without process or trial. They appealed to a General Council.

Of these eighteen, the most distinguished was Julianus, Bishop of Eclana, in Campania. His ^{Julianus of} opinions did not altogether agree with those ^{Eclana.} of Pelagius and Celestius;^q he was the founder of what has been called Sēmi-Pelagianism. Julianus from his birth, his character, and the events of his life, was a remarkable man. He was of a noble family, the son of a bishop, Memor, for whom Augustine entertained the warmest friendship.^r He was early admitted into the lower order of the clergy, and married a virgin of birth and virtue equal to his own. She was of the Æmilian family, daughter of the Bishop of Beneventum.

The epithalamium of Julianus and Ia was written by the holy Paullinus, Bishop of Nola. The poet urges

^p Augustin. de Pecc. Orig., 3, 4; in Julian, 1, c. 4. Prosper in Chronic.

^q The great point of difference was that Pelagius held Adam to have been

born mortal; Julianus admitted that the sin of Adam had brought death into the world.

^r Augustin. contr. Julian., i. 12.

upon the young and ardent couple not to break off their dangerous nuptials, but after their marriage to preserve their inviolate chastity. The pious bishop has, indeed, some misgivings as to the success of his poetic persuasions, and adds, that if they are betrayed into the weakness of having offspring, he trusts that they will make compensation to that state, which they have robbed of its brightest ornaments, by dedicating all their children, a sacerdotal family, to virginity.⁸ Julianus was a man of great accomplishments, well read in the writers, especially the poets of Italy and Greece. But neither his illustrious descent, his Roman or his Christian kindred, nor his talents, nor his virtues, nor his station availed in the least in this desperate conflict at once with power and popular opinion. There were now arrayed in formidable and irresistible confederacy, the three commanding influences in Western Christendom, the Pope, the Emperor, and Augustine. The Pope, indignant at the demand for a General Council, proceeded to involve Julianus and the rest of the eighteen remonstrants under the anathema pronounced against Pelagius, and to depose him from his see. Julianus had but the unsatisfactory consolation of asserting that Zosimus dared not meet him before a General Council. The Emperor was at first disposed to accede to the demand for a Council, but the influence of Augustine with the Count Valerius changed the impartial judge into an implacable adversary. He is even accused, and by his most respected adversary Julianus, of employing every means, even those of cor-

* Ut sit in ambobus concordia virginitatis
Aut sint ambo sacris semina virginibus
Votorum prior hic gradus est, ut nescia carnis
Membra gerant, quod si corpore con-
gruerint

Casta sacerdotalis genus ventura propago,
Et domus Aaron sit tota domus Memo-
ris.

Paul. Nolan. *Epithalamium*, circa finem.

ruption, to inflame the minds of the powerful against the followers of Pelagius.^t A new Imperial edict sentenced to exile Julianus and all the bishops who had fallen under the anathema of Zosimus. A second rescript followed, commanding all bishops not merely to subscribe the dominant opinions on these profound and abstruse topics, but to condemn their authors, Pelagius and Celestius, as irreclaimable heretics, and this under pain of deprivation and banishment. Justly might Julianus taunt his ecclesiastical brethren with this attempt to crush their adversaries by the civil power. With shame and sorrow we hear from Augustine himself that fatal axiom, which for centuries reconciled the best and holiest men to the guilt of persecution, the axiom which impiously arrayed cruelty in the garb of Christian charity—that they were persecuted in compassion to their souls;^u that they ought to be thankful for the kind violence, which did them no real injury, but coerced them for their good; and that if for this end the secular power was called in, it was to restrain them from their sacrilegious temerity.^x

Thus then, on these men had fallen the ban of ecclesiastical and secular power, and in the West, ^{His persecution.} at least, of popular opinion.^y Pelagius vanishes at this time from history; he had been condemned by

^t See note infra.

^u Non impotentiae contra vos precamur auxilium, sed pro vobis potius ut ab ausu sacrilego conibeamini, Christianae potentiae laudamus officium. —Oper. Imperf., l. ii., c. 14.

^x Compare l. 10, where he says that Christian powers (he means the civil powers) are bound to use disciplinam coercionis against all opponents

of the Catholic faith.

^y Julianus, it appears, objected to Augustine that all his authorities were Western bishops. This Augustine does not deny, but demands whether the authority of St. Peter and his successor, Innocent, is not enough. —Contr. Julian., 1, c. 13. He quotes, however, Gregory of Nazianzum and Basil.

a Council at Antioch, and driven, a second Catiline as he is called by Jerome, from Jerusalem: of his end nothing is known. The more courageous and active Celestius still kept up the vain strife. Twice he returned to Rome during the episcopacy of the successor of Zosimus, and twice again was banished. At length, with Julianus, he took refuge at Constantinople, where he obtained a more favourable hearing both from the reigning Emperor, the younger Theodosius, and from Nestorius, the bishop. But his enemies were watchful, and Constantinople refused to entertain the condemned heresiarch: of his death likewise history is silent. The accomplished Julianus,² exiled from his see, proscribed not merely by the harsh edicts of power, but hunted by popular detestation from town to town, wandered through Christendom, as if he bore a divine judgement upon him. His long and weary life was protracted thirty years after his exile.^a At length he settled as teacher of a school, in an obscure town of Sicily. The last act of the proscribed heretic was to sacrifice all he had to relieve the poor in a grievous famine. Some

* The fragments of the writings of Julianus, especially those in the *Opus Imperfectum* of Augustine, show great acuteness and eloquence, and a facility and perspicuity of style which bears no unfavourable comparison with the great African father. His piety is unimpeachable.

^a Julianus constantly taunts Augustine with this appeal to the passions of the rude and ignorant vulgar on such abstruse subjects, and with even worse means of persecuting his adversaries. *Cur seditioes Romæ conductis populis excitastis? Cur de sumptibus pauperum saginastis per totam pane*

African, equorum greges, quos prosequenti Olybio, tribunis et centurionibus destinastis? Cui matronarum oblati hereditatibus potestates sæculi corrupistis, ut in nos stipula furoris publice ardeat? Cur dissipastis Ecclesiarum quietem? Cui religiosi principes tempora persecutionum impietate maculastis?—*Oper. Imperfect.,* iii. 74.

Augustine contents himself by simply denying these charges, the last of which, by his own showing and by the extant edicts, was too true.

In another place Julianus says, *Ut erecto cornu dogma popolare.*—*Oper. Imperfect.,* ii. 2.

faithful follower, it is said, whether in zeal for his tenets or admiration for his virtues, inscribed on his tomb, "Here sleeps in peace Julianus, the Catholic Bishop."

While the West in general bowed before the commanding authority of Augustine; trembled and shrunk from any opinion which might even seem to impeach the sovereignty of God; laid its free will down a ready sacrifice before divine grace, as contained in the sacraments of the Church and administered by the awful hierarchy; hesitated not to abandon the whole world, external to the Church, to that inevitable hell which was the patrimony of all the children of Adam; Semi-Pelagianism arose in another quarter, and under different auspices, and maintained an obstinate contest for considerably more than a century. This school grew up among the monasteries in the south of France. Among its partisans were some of the most eminent bishops of that province. The most distinguished, if not the first founder, of this Gallic Semi-Pelagianism was the monk Cassianus.

Cassianus.

The birth-place of Cassianus is uncertain, but if not Greek or Oriental by birth, he was either one or the other, or both, by education.^b His youth was passed in the Eastern monasteries, first in Bethlehem, afterwards in Egypt. Eastern and Egyptian monachism, like its more remote ancestor in India, and its more immediate parent, the Essenism or Therapeutism of the Jews, was anything but a blind or humble Predesti-

* Notwithstanding the express words of Gennadius, Cassianus natione Scythæ, he has been supposed an African. He is called Afer in the list of ecclesiastical writers by Honorius (lxi. c. 84); an

Egyptian (Pagi, Basnage, Fabricius); a Latin (Photius, c. 197); a Gaul (Caid. Norris and the *Benedictines Hist. Lit. de la France*).

narianism. It was the strength and triumph of the human will. It was the self-wrought victory over the bondage of matter; the violent avulsion and stern estrangement from all the indulgences, the pursuits, the affections, the society of the world. The dreamy and passive state of the monk, in which he was surrendered to spiritual influences, began not till his own determination had withdrawn him into the austere and eremetical solitude. There man might be commingled, in absolute identity, with the Godhead. Every act of remorseless asceticism was a meritorious demand on the divine approbation. The divine influence was wrestled for and won by the resolute and prevailing votary, not bestowed as the unsought gift of God. Cassianus passed from Egypt to Constantinople, where he became the favoured pupil of that Greek Father whose writings are throughout the most adverse to the Augustinian system. The whole theology of Chrysostom, in its general impression, is a plain and practical appeal to the free will of man. He addresses man as invested in an awful responsibility, but as self-dependent, self-determining to good or evil. The depravity against which he inveighs is no inherited, inherent corruption, to be dispossessed only by divine grace, but a personal, spontaneous, self-originating, and self-maintained surrender to evil influences; to be broken off by a vigorous effort of religious faith, to be controlled by severe self-imposed religious discipline. As far as is consistent with prayer and devotion, man is master of his own destiny. The Augustinian questions of predestination, grace, the foreknowledge of God, even, in general, the atonement and the extent of its consequences, lie without the sphere of Chrysostom's theology. Cassianus received at least

the first holy orders from Chrysostom. During the disturbances in Constantinople relating to his deposal, Cassianus was sent to Rome on a mission to Pope Innocent I. To the memory of Chrysostom he preserved the most fervent attachment. Chrysostom was to him a second John the Evangelist.*

Probably after the fall of Chrysostom, Cassianus settled at Marseilles, and founded two monas- Cassianus
in Gaul. teries, one of men and one of women, in which he introduced the severe discipline of the East. Marseilles was Greek; it retained to a late period the character and, to some degree, the language of a Grecian colony; no doubt, on that account, it was congenial to Cassianus. But Cassianus became so completely master of Latin as to write in that language his Monastic Institutes, the austere and inflexible code followed in most of the cœnobitic foundations north of the Alps; and it is chiefly from this work that posterity can collect the Semi-Pelagian opinions of its author.^d Already, however, some of the faithful partisans of Augustine had given the alarm at this tendency towards rebellion against the dictatorship of their master. Prosper and Hilarius denounced this yet more secret defection of those who presumed to impugn with

* Adoptatus a beatissimæ memoriæ Joanne in ministerium sacrum atque oblatum Deo Mementote magistrorum vestrorum veterum sacerdotumque vestrorum Joannis fide ac puritate mirabilis: Joannis inquam, Joannis illius qui verè ad similitudinem Joannis Evangelistæ, et discipulus Jezu et Apostolus, quasi super pectus domini semper affectumque discubuit . . . Qui

communis mihi ac vobis magister fuit; cujus discipuli et institutio sumus, et seqq.—Cassianus de Incarn. c. 31.

^d There has been a controversy whether Cassianus was a Semi-Pelagian. With his works before them, even from the same passages of his works, grave and learned men have argued on both sides.

vain objections the holy Augustine on the grace of God.* The last works which occupied Augustine were addressed to Prosper and Hilarius, in order to check this daring inroad, and to establish on irrefragable grounds the predestination of the saints and the gift of perseverance.^f

The partisans of Augustine continued to wage the war with all the burning zeal and imperious authority of their master. A school arose, not of theology alone, but of poetry. Prosper, in a long poem, compelled the reluctant language and form of Latin verse to condemn the "ungrateful," who in their wanton pride ascribed partly to themselves, not absolutely to the Grace of God, the work of their salvation. Prosper and Hilarius were followed by a long line of assertors of the Augustinian Predestinarianism, of which Fulgentius was the most rigid and inexorable advocate.^g

Cassianus, on the other side, handed down to a succession of more or less bold disciples the aversion to the extreme views of Augustine. It is doubtful whether the Vincentius, who espoused his opinions, was the celebrated Abbot of Lerins, the author of the 'Communitory.' At a later period Faustus, Bishop of Riez, brought the sanction of learning, high character, and sanctity to the same cause.

* *Gratiam Dei, qua Christiani sumus, qui tam dicere audent a sanctæ memoriæ Augustino Episcopo non rectè esse defensam, librosque ejus contra errorem Pelagianum conditos immoderatis calumniis impetere non quiescunt.* — Prosper contr. Collatores, c. 1.

^f *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum*

liber ad Prosuperum et Hilarium
De dono perseverantiæ liber ad Prosuperum et Hilarium secundus.

^g Fulgentius was the predecessor of that modern divine who is said to have spoken of the comfortable doctrine of the eternal damnation of little children.

Semi-Pelagianism aspired to hold the balance between Pelagius and Augustine;^h to steer a safe and middle course between the abysses into which each, on either side, had plunged in desperate presumption.ⁱ It emphatically repudiated the heresy of Pelagius in the denial of original sin; it asserted divine grace, but it seemed to confine divine grace to the outward means, the Scriptures and the sacraments, rather than to its inward and direct workings on the soul itself.

But it condemned with equal resolution the system of Augustine, by which the grace of God was hardened into an iron necessity; it reproached him with that Manicheism which divided mankind into two hard antagonistic masses.^k

But of all religious controversies this alone had the merit of not growing up into a fatal and implacable schism.^m The Semi-Pelagians, though condemned in several successive councils, were not cast out of the Church, and did not therefore form separate and hostile

^h Sed nec cum hæreticis tibi, nec cum Catholicis plena concordia est . . . tu informe, nescio quid. tertium et utraque parte inconveniens reperisti, quo nec inimicorum consensum adquirerer, nec in nostrorum permaneres.—Prosper, c. ii. p. 117.

ⁱ Compare Walch, v. p. 56.

^k Compare the letter of Prosper to Rufinus, in which Augustine is said to make duas humani generis massas, an error as bad as that of heathens or Manicheans.

^m No question has been more disputed in later days, or with less certain result, than whether there was

a distinct sect of Predestinarians at this period. The controversy originated in the publication of a remarkable tract, the "Prædestinatus," by the Jesuit Sirmond. The great object was to clear the memory of Augustine, who was claimed both by Jesuits and Jansenists. Such a sect, if it existed, would carry off from St. Augustine all the charges heaped upon Predestinarianism at that time. If they were heretics, Augustine was of unimpeached orthodoxy, and therefore could not have held a condemnable Predestinarianism. Walch discusses the question at length, vol. v.

communities. This rare mutual respect, which now prevailed, is no doubt to be attributed to one important cause. The monasteries, which were held in such profound and universal veneration, were the chief schools of these doctrines; some of the most austere and most admired of these Cœnobites were the chief assertors of the free will of man.ⁿ

* Prosper himself betrays this enforced respect and its peculiar source:—

Nec tibi fallacis subrepat imago decoris,
Nullum ex his errare putes, hæc in Cruce
vitam

Ducant, et jugi afficiant sua corpora morte
Abstineant opibus; sint casti; sintque benigni;

Terrenisque ferant animum super astra relictis;

Si tamen hæc propria virtute capessere
quenquam

Possunt, sitve ut dignus labor iste
jvari.

Ingenium meruisse aut bona vera petentis;

Crescere quo cupiunt, minuuntur; proficundo

Deficiunt; surgendo cadunt, currendo recedunt;

Unde etenim vani frustra splendescere quærunt,

Inde obcurantur quoniam sua, laudis amore,

Non quæ sunt Christi quærunt, nec fit Deus illis

Principium et capiti non dant in corpore regnum.

Proper ad Ingratis, xxxvii.

CHAPTER III.

Nestorianism.

ZOSIMUS filled the See of Rome only a year and nine months. His short pontificate was agitated not only by the Pelagian controversy, but by disputes with the bishops of Southern Gaul and of Africa, hereafter to be considered when the relations of those provinces to the See of Rome shall take their place in our history.

Mar. 18, 417
Dec. 26, 418.
Death of
Zosimus.

The death of Zosimus gave rise to the third contested election for the See of Rome.

The greater the dignity of the Bishop of Rome, and the more lofty his pretensions to supremacy, the more would ambition covet this post of power and distinction; the more, on the other hand, would holy and Christian emulation aspire to place the worthiest prelate in this commanding station; and men's opinions would not always concur as to the ecclesiastic best qualified to preside over Western Christendom. Thus while the most ungovernable worldly passions and interests would intrude themselves into the election, honest religious zeal, often the blindest, always the most obstinate of human motives, would esteem it a sacred duty to espouse, an inpious weakness to abandon, some favourite cause.

Disputed
election,
Dec. 27, 28.

The unsettled form of the election, and the undefined rights of the electors, could not but increase the difficulty and exasperate the strife. The absolute nomination by the clergy would have

Unsettled
form of
election.

been no security against contested elections; for in every double election a large part of the clergy was ranged on either side, and formed the rival factions. A certain assent of the people was still considered necessary to ratify the appointment. At all events, the people looked on the election with such profound interest, during a contest with such violent excitement, that it was impossible to exclude them from interference; and both factions were so anxious for their support, that only the losing party would see the impropriety of their tumultuous mingling in the fray. The election of the Bishop was now as much an affair of the whole city as that of a consul or a dictator of old, without the ancient and time-honoured regulations for collecting the suffrages by centuries or by tribes.

And who were the people? Was this right equally shared by all the members of the religious community, now almost co-extensive in number with the inhabitants of the city? Had the Senate any special privilege, or were all these rights of the laity vested in the Emperor alone as the supreme civil power, and so in the Prefect of Rome, the representative of imperial authority? The popular universal suffrage, which, in a small primitive church, one pervaded with pure Christian piety, tended to harmony, became an uncontrolled democratic anarchy when the bishopric included a vast city. It is surprising that this difficulty, which was not removed until, at a comparatively recent period, the election was vested in the College of Cardinals, was not fatal to the supremacy of Rome. But though the wild scenes of anarchy and tumult, which, especially from the eighth to the eleventh century, impaired the authority of the Pope in Rome itself, and desecrated his person; though the successful Pon-

tiff was often only the head of a triumphant faction, and was either disobeyed, or obeyed with undisguised reluctance, by the defeated party; still distance seemed to soften off all this unseemly confusion, above which the Pope appeared seated on his serene and lofty throne in undiminished majesty. It constantly happened that at the very time at which in Rome the Pope was insulted, maltreated, wounded, imprisoned, driven from the city, the extreme parts of Christendom were bowing to his decrees in unshaken reverence.

Twice already—perhaps more than twice—had Rome been afflicted with a fierce and prolonged contest. The austere bigotry of Novatian had maintained his claim against the authority of Cornelius. Felix had been the antipope to Liberius. The streets of Rome had run with blood, the churches had been defiled with dead bodies, in the more recent strife of Damasus and Ursicinus.

On the death of Zosimus, some of the clergy chose the Archdeacon Eulalius in the Lateran Church; on the same, or the next day, a larger number met in the Church of S. Theodora, and elected the Presbyter Boniface. Three bishops, among whom was the Bishop of Ostia, either compelled, it was said, or, yielding through the weakness of extreme old age, consecrated Eulalius. Boniface was inaugurated by nine bishops in the presence of seventy presbyters, in the Church of St. Marcellus. Rome might apprehend the return of those terrible and bloody days which marked the elevation of Damasus. The Prefect of Rome was Symmachus, son of that eloquent orator who had defended with so much energy the lost cause of paganism. The outward conformity, at least, of Symmachus to Christianity may be presumed from the

Dec. 27, 28.

Double election.

favour of Honorius; but it is curious to find a contest for the Papacy dependent for its decision on the son of such a father. Symmachus, in his report to

the Emperor, inclines towards the party of

Eulalius. Boniface was summoned to Ravenna. He delayed to obey the mandate, which reached him when he was performing his sacred functions with-

out the city; the officers of the Prefect were maltreated by the populace of his party. The

gates of Rome, therefore, were closed upon Boniface, and Eulalius, in great state, amid the acclamations of part, at least, of the people, took possession of St. Peter's, the Capitol, as it were, of Christianity.

The party of Boniface were not inactive, or without influence at the court of Ravenna. The petition to the Emperor declared that all the Presbyters of Rome would accompany Boniface, to make known her will

or, rather, the judgement of God.^a Honorius issued a rescript, with supercilious impartiality

commanding both prelates to remain at a distance from the city, until the cause should be decided by a synod of bishops from Italy, Gaul, and Africa. In the mean time, as the Roman people could not be deprived of the solemn rites of Easter, Achilleus, Bishop of Spoleto, was ordered to officiate during the vacancy. Eulalius would not endure this sacrilegious usurpation of the powers of his see. He surprised by night, at the head of that part of the populace which was on his side, the Lateran Church; and in contempt of the Emperor's orders, celebrated the holy rites. But the days of suc-

^a *Prelectis singulis Titulis, presbyteri omnes adierunt, qui voluntatem suam, hoc est, iudicium Dei prolo-* quantur.—*Apud Baronium, sub ann.* 419.

cessful conflict with the civil power were not yet come. The rashness of Eulalius estranged even Symmachus from his cause:^b this act was treated as one of rebellion. Eulalius was expelled from the city. He was threatened, as well as all the clergy who adhered to him, with still more fearful penalties. The laity who communicated with Eulalius were to be punished, the higher orders with banishment and confiscation, slaves with death. The primates of the Regions of Rome were to be responsible for all popular tumults. Such was the commanding judgement of the Emperor.^c

Boniface took possession without further contest of the Pontifical throne. He was the son of a presbyter^d named Jocondus, a Roman by birth; he was an aged prelate, of mild and blameless character; wisely anxious to prevent, as far as possible, the scandals, and even crimes, in which he had been so nearly involved. He addressed the Emperor urging the enactment of a law, a civil law, which should restrain ecclesiastical ambition, and coerce those who aspired to obtain by intrigue, what ought to be the reward of piety and holiness. Honorius issued an edict, that in case of a contested election both the rival candidates should be excluded from the office, and a new appointment made. Thus the Imperial power assumed, and was acknowledged to possess, full authority to regulate the election of Bishops of Rome.^e During the three years of the pontificate of Boniface, the Pelagian controversy was still drawing out its almost interminable length.

^b Symmachi rescript. apud Baron.

^c See the rescript of Honorius, apud Baronium.

^d Platin. vit. Bonifac.

^e Rescriptum Honorii, apud Baronium.

Boniface
Pope,
Apr. 10.

On the death of Boniface,^f Eulalius refused to leave the seclusion into which he had retired; the decline of life may have softened his ambition—for he died the following year. Celestine was elected, and ruled in peace the see of Rome. The Pontificates of Celestine I.^g and his successor Sixtus III.^h were occupied by the Nestorian controversy: occupied, but hardly disturbed. The East, as it has appeared, had stood aloof, serene and unimpassioned, throughout the Pelagian controversy; in Palestine, the Latin Jerome alone, and his partisans the two Western bishops of doubtful fame, would not endure the presence of Pelagius. In Alexandria and Constantinople. Predestination, Grace, Free Will, excited no tumults, arrayed against each other no hostile factions, demanded no councils. The Bishop of Constantinople pronounced his authoritative decrees, which no one desired to question; and expelled from his diocese Celestius, or Pelagius himself, whom no one cared to defend. They alone, of all powerful heresiarchs in Constantinople, neither distracted the Imperial court, nor maddened the popular faction.

Latin Christianity contemplated with almost equal indifference Nestorianism, and all its prolific race, Eutychianism, Monophysitism, Monotheism. While in this contest the two great Patriarchates of the East, Constantinople and Alexandria, brought to issue, or strove to bring to issue, their rival claims to ascendancy; while council after council promulgated, reversed, re-enacted their conflicting decrees; while separate and hostile communities were formed in every

^f Boniface died Nov. 4, 422.

July, 432.

^g Celestine I., Nov. 10, 422; died

^h Sixtus III., 432; died 440.

region of the East; and the fears of persecuted Nestorianism, stronger than religious zeal, penetrated for refuge remote countries, into which Christianity had not yet found its way: in the West there was no Nestorian, or Eutychian sect. Some councils condemned, but with hardly an audible remonstrance, these uncongenial heresies: the doctrines are condemned, but there appears no body of heretics whom it is thought necessary to strike with the anathema.

In the East, religion ceased more and more to be an affair of pure religion. It was mingled up with all the intrigues of the Imperial court, with all the furies of faction in the great cities. The council was the arena, not merely for Christian doctrine, but for worldly ascendancy. Secular ambition could no longer be distinguished, nor could the warring prelates themselves distinguish it, from zeal for orthodoxy. Religious questions being decided by the favour of the Emperor, the Empress, or the ruling minister, eunuch or barbarian, that favour was sought by the most unscrupulous means—by intrigue, by adulation, by bribery; and these means became hallowed. There was no sacrifice with which Alexandria would not purchase superiority over Constantinople, or Constantinople over Alexandria: the rivalry of the sees darkened into the fiercest personal hostility.

In the mean time the Bishop of Rome, unembarrassed with the intricacies of the question, which had no temptation for his more practical understanding, with the whole West participating in his comparative apathy, could sit, at a distance, a tranquil arbiter, and interfere only when he saw his own advantage, or when all parties, exasperated or wearied out, gladly submitted to any foreign or unpledged judgement. The Eastern

prelates, too eager to destroy each other, were either blind to, or in the heat of mutual detestation disregarded this silent aggression, and admitted principles without suspicion fatal to their own independence.

On the nature of the Godhead the inexhaustible East had not yet nearly run the whole round of speculative thought; the Greek language still found new gradations on which it might employ its fine and subtile distinctiveness. All these controversies, which began anew with Nestorianism, sprang by lineal and unbroken descent from the great ancestral principle. The same Oriental tenet (however it may not, at first sight, be apparent) which gave birth to the various Gnostic sects, and to Manicheism, had lain at the root of Arianism,¹ now quickened into life Nestorianism and all its kindred race. Arianism had arisen out of that profound sense of the malignancy of matter, which in its grosser influence had led to the Manichean Dualism. The pure, primal, parental Deity must stand entirely aloof from all connexion with that in which evil was inherent, inveterate, inextinguishable. This was the absolute essence of Deity; this undisturbed, unattainted Spiritualism, which disdained, repelled, abhorred the contact, the approximation of the Corporeal, which once assimilating to, or condescending to assume any of the attributes of Matter, ceased to be the Godhead.

¹ Hist. of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 369. Add to the authorities there quoted this decisive passage from Arius himself, apud Athanas. xvi. de Syn. εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐκ γαστροῦ (Psalm cx. 3) καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξηλθον, καὶ ἦκα, ὡς μέρος αὐτοῦ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπάρχων νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἐστὶν ὁ πατὴρ καὶ διαιρετὸς καὶ τρεπτὸς καὶ σῶμα κατ' αὐτοῦς. Arius accused his adversaries of destroying this pure spirituality of the Father, by asserting the ὁμοούσια of the Son. The Father became likewise composed of parts, divisible, mutable, corporeal; and to him this was an unanswerable argument.

By the triumph of Athanasian Trinitarianism, and by the gradual dominance which it had obtained ^{Trinitarianism established.} over the general mind of Christendom, the coequal and consubstantial Godhead in the Trinity had become an article of the universal creed in the Latin Church. Arianism survived only among the barbarians. The East adhered almost as generally to the Creed of Nicæa. The Son, therefore, had become, if the expression may be ventured, more and more divine; he was more completely not merely assimilated, but absolutely identified, with the original, perfect, uncontaminated Godhead. Yet his descent into the material world, his admixture with the external, the sensible, the created—his assumption of the form and being of man (which all agreed to be essential to the Christian scheme, not in seeming alone, according to the Docetic notion, but actually and really)—must be guarded by the same jealousy of infecting his pure and spiritual essence by the earthly contagion: that which would have been fatal to the spirituality of the Father might endanger the same prerogative of the Son. The divine and human nature could not indeed be kept separate, but they must be united with the least possible sacrifice of their essential attributes. If (according to Nestorius) the Eternal and Co-equal Word were *born*, this was a denial of his pre-existence; and to assert that he could be liable to passion or suffering, ^{Views of Nestorius.} in the same manner violated the pure spirituality of the Godhead. He proposed, therefore, that the appellation, Christ, should be confined, and, as it were, kept sacred, as signifying the Being, composed of the blended, yet unconfounded, God and man; and that the Virgin should

* Patibilis.

be the mother of Christ, the God-man, not the mother of God, of the unassociated divinity.^m This is the key to the whole controversy. Never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed to the Nicene Creed: both admitted the pre-existence, the impassibility of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty, which the Christians in that age, and unhappily in subsequent ages, have imposed upon themselves, of considering the detection of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable. Men like Cyril of Alexandria, in whom religion might seem to have inflamed and embittered, instead of allaying, the worst passions of our nature, pride, ambition, cruelty, rapacity; and Councils like that of Ephesus, with all the tumult and violence without the dignity of a senate or popular assembly, convulsed the East, and led to a fierce irreconcilable schism.

The stern repudiation of the term, the Mother of God, encountered another sentiment, which
Worship of the Virgin. had been rapidly growing up, as one of the dominant influences of the Christian mind. The worship of the Virgin had arisen from the confluence of many pure and gentle and many natural feelings. The reverence for everything connected with the Redeemer, especially by ties so close and tender, would not with cold jealousy watch and limit its ardent language. The more absolute deification, if it may be so said, of Christ; the forgetfulness of his humanity induced by his investment in more remote and awful Godhead,—created a want of some more kindred and

^m Χριστοτοκίς: not Θεοτοκός.

familiar object of adoration. The worship of the intermediate saints admitted that of the Virgin as its least dangerous, most affecting, most consolatory part. The exquisite beauty and purity of the images, the Virgin Mother and the Divine Infant, though not as yet embodied in the highest art, by painting or sculpture, appealed to the unreasoning and unsuspecting heart. To this was added, the superior influence with which Christianity had invested the female sex, and which naturally gave to this gentler and kindred object of adoring love. In one of the earliest documents relating to this controversy, the honour conferred on the female sex by the birth of the Lord from the Virgin Mary is dwelt upon in glowing terms: woman's glory is inseparably connected with that of the Virgin Mother. The power exercised by females at the court of Constantinople, now by the sisters and wives, the Pulcherias and Eudoxias, at other times by the mothers of Emperors, the Helenas and Irenes, as in some degree springing from Christianity, was strengthened by, and in its turn strengthened, this adoration of the Virgin Mary, which interposed itself between that of Christ, and still more that of God the Father, and the worshipping Christian.

With this view accords the whole course of the history. On the death of Sisinnius Bishop of Constantinople, the Emperor, the younger Promotion of Nestorius, A.D. 428. Theodosius, to terminate the intrigues and factions among the clergy of the city, summoned Nestorius from Antioch to the Episcopal Throne of the Eastern Rome.ⁿ Nestorius appeared, simple in his dress, grave

ⁿ Nestorius was a Syrian, a native of Germanicia. — Socrat. vii. 29. Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. iv. 12. Simcon

Batharsam. apud Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. i. 546

in his demeanour, pale and meagre from ascetic observances, and with the fame of surpassing eloquence.^o He revived to the expecting city the fond remembrance of Chrysostom, who, like him, had been *called* from Antioch to Constantinople.^p The Golden Mouth was again to appal and delight the city. But the religion of Chrysostom, from its strong practical character, had escaped that speculative tinge which seemed natural to the Syrian mind. The last lingering vestiges of Gnosticism survived in Syria. Arius, though not a Syrian Presbyter, found his most ardent adherents in that province; and now from the same quarter sprang this new theory, which, though it rested its claim to orthodoxy on its irreconcilable hostility to Arianism, grew out of the same principle.

Anastasius, a presbyter, who accompanied Nestorius from Antioch, first sounded the clarion of strife and confusion. He publicly preached *that* it was improper and even impious to address the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God. The indignation and excitement of the city was heightened by fast-spreading rumours, that the Bishop not merely refused to silence the sacrilegious Presbyter, but openly avowed the same opinion.^q As is usual, the subtle distinctions of Nestorius were unheard or unintelligible to the common ear. He proscribed an appellation to which the pulpits and the services of the Church had habituated the general mind. The tenet jarred upon the high-strung sensitiveness of an inveterate faith, and awoke resentment,

^o Tautâ antea opinione vixisti, ut tuis te aliena civitas invaderet. Such is the honourable testimony borne to the character of Nestorius by Pope Celestine.—Epistol. ad Nestor., Mansi,

iv. 1206.

^p Cassian. De Incarn. vii. 30. Tille mont, page 286.

^q Sociates. E. H. vii. 29, 32.

on which the finest argument was lost. In the great Metropolitan Church the Bishop delivered a sermon on the Incarnation of the Lord.^r As ^{Sermons of Nestorius.} an orator he placed his own theory in the most brilliant light. He dwelt on the omnipotence, the glory, and all the transcendent attributes of God the Creator, and of God the Redeemer. "And can this God have a mother?"^s "The heathen notion of a God born of a mortal mother is directly confuted by St. Paul, who declares the Lord without father and without mother. Could a creature bear the Uncreated? Could the Word, which was with the Father before the worlds, become a new-born infant? The human nature alone was born of the Virgin: that which is of the flesh is flesh.^t The manhood was the instrument of the divine purposes, the outward and visible vesture of the Invisible. God was incarnate, indeed, but God died not; his death was but casting off the weeds of mortality, which he had assumed for a time." A second and a third sermon followed, in which Nestorius still further unfolded his opinions: "Like can but bear like; a human mother can only bear a human being. God was not born—he dwelt in that which was born; the Divinity underwent not the slow process of growth and development during the nine months of pregnancy." But the more perplexing and subtle are arguments addressed to those whose judgment is already ratified by their passions, they only inflame resentment instead of working conviction. The whole city was in an uproar; every ecclesiastical rule broken asunder. The

^r Socrates, H. E. vii. 32. Evagrius,
.. 2. Liberatus. Breviar. c. 4.

^s Socrates, ut supra.

^t Marius Mercator, ed't. Garnier ii
p. 5.

presbyters, in every quarter, preached against their bishop; and a bold monk (the monks were always the faithful representatives of the religious passions of their age) forbade the Bishop, as an obstinate heretic, to approach the altar. Nestorius (and in all his subsequent afflictions it must be remembered that, when in power, he scrupled not to persecute) did not bear these insults with Christian equanimity, or repress them with calm dignity. The refractory priests and the tumultuous people were seized, tried, and scourged more cruelly than in a land of barbarians. Nestorius, it is said, with his own hand, struck the presumptuous monk, and then made him over to the officers, who flogged him through the streets, with a crier going before to proclaim his offence, and then cast him out of the city.*

Nestorius found in Constantinople its more dangerous antagonist. On a festival in honour of the Virgin, Proclus Bishop of Cyzicum (an unsuccessful rival, it is said, of Nestorius for the Metropolitan See)

* This is the account indeed of a partisan—the report of Basilus to the Emperor Theodosius. Labbe, Concil. But his whole history shows the persecuting spirit of Nestorius:—"The fifth day after his consecration he endeavoured to deprive the Arians of their church: they burned it down in despair. He was called by his enemies Nestorius the Incendiary." Socrat. vii. 29. He excited also a violent persecution against the Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Macedonians. Ibid. et c. 31. The most damning fact against him, however, is his own boast that he procured an imperial law of the utmost severity against all heretics: Ego, certe legem inter ipsa meæ ordinationis initia contra eos, qui Christum purum hominem dicunt, et contra reliquas hæreses innovavi. Mansi, v. 731 or 763. For the Law, see Cod. Theodos. de Hæret. Vincentius Lirinensis writes of Nestorius, Ut uni hæresi aditum patefaceret, cunctarum hæreseon blasphemias insectabatur.—Commonit. c. 16. Nestorius was in character a monk, without humility. "Give me (such is the speech ascribed to him as addressed to the Emperor) a world freed from heresy, and I will give you the kingdom of heaven. Aid me in subduing the heretics, I will aid you in routing the Persians."

delivered a passionate appeal to the dominant feeling. The worship of the Virgin, in the most poetic ages of Christianity, has hardly surpassed the images which Proclus poured forth in lavish profusion in honour of the Mother of God. "Earth and sea did homage to the Virgin: the sea smoothing its serene waters, earth conducting the secure travellers who thronged to her festival. Nature exulted, and womankind was glorified." "We are assembled in honour of the Mother of God" (the appellation condemned by Nestorius); "the spotless treasure-house of virginity; the spiritual paradise of the second Adam; the workshop, in which the two natures were annealed together; the bridal chamber in which the Word wedded the flesh; the living bush of nature, which was unharmed by the fire of the divine birth: the light cloud, which bore Him which sat between the Cherubim; the stainless fleece, bathed in the dews of heaven, with which the Shepherd clothed his sheep; the handmaid and the mother, the Virgin and Heaven;"—and so on through a wild labyrinth of untranslatable metaphor.* The cloudy opening cleared off into something like argument; it became an elaborate reply to Nestorius, the declaration of war from one who felt his strength in the popular feeling.

But the war was not confined to Constantinople; it involved the whole East. Now rushed forward an adversary far more formidable in station, in ability, in that character for Christian ortho-

Cyril of
Alexandria.

* This sermon of Proclus (to be 'moderation. In dieser ganzer Rede found Labbe, Concil. sub ann.) is said, (the answer of Nestorius) herrschet so in the ancient preface, to have been viel Bescheidenheit, als gewiss in andern delivered in the great church, in the polemischen Schriften dieses Zeitalters presence of Nestorius. Nestorius appears to have answered this attack with kaum angetroffen wird. — Walch, v. p. 376.

doxy of doctrine which then hallowed every act, even every crime, but from which true Christianity would avert its sight in shame and anguish, that such a champion should be accepted as the representative of the Gospel of peace and love. Cyril of Alexandria, to those who esteem the stern and uncompromising assertion of certain Christian tenets the one paramount Christian virtue, may be the hero, even the saint; but while ambition, intrigue, arrogance, rapacity, and violence are proscribed as unchristian means—barbarity, persecution, bloodshed as unholy and unevangelic wickednesses—posterity will condemn the orthodox Cyril as one of the worst of heretics against the spirit of the Gospel. Who would not meet the judgement of the Divine Redeemer loaded with the errors of Nestorius, rather than with the barbarities of Cyril?

Cyril was the nephew of Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, a worthy successor to the see and to the character of that haughty and unscrupulous prelate, the enemy of Chrysostom. Jealousy and animosity towards the Bishop of Constantinople was a sacred legacy bequeathed by Theophilus to his nephew, and Cyril faithfully administered the fatal trust. He inherited even the bitter personal hatred of Chrysostom; refused to concur in the general respect for his memory, and in the reversal, after his death, of the unjust sentence of deposition from his see. He scrupled not to call the eloquent, and in all religious tenets and principles absolutely blameless Christian orator, a second Judas.^y The general voice of Christendom alone compelled him to desist from this posthumous persecution. Nor was Cyril content without surpassing his haughty

^y *Epist. ad Attic. apud Labbe, 204.*

kinsman in the pretensions of his archiepiscopate. From his accession, observes the ecclesiastical historian of the time, the bishops of Alexandria aspired, far beyond the limits of the sacerdotal power, to rule with sovereign authority.^a They confronted, and, as will appear, contended on equal terms and with the same weapons, against the Imperial magistracy.^a

The first act of Cyril's episcopacy was that of a persecutor. He closed the churches of the Novatians, seized and confiscated all their sacred treasures, and stripped the bishop of all his possessions. The war which he commenced against the heretics he continued against the Jews and heathens. But the numerous and wealthy Jews of Alexandria, who multiplied as fast as they were diminished by their own feuds or feuds with the Christians, were not to be oppressed so easily as a small and unpopular sect of Christians. Cyril must have been well acquainted with the fierce and violent temperament of the Alexandrian populace, and with their proverbial character, that their factions never ended without bloodshed.^b But Cyril had himself too much of the hot Egyptian blood in his veins; and the bishop, instead of allaying this sanguinary propensity by the gentle and humanising influences of Christianity, was rarely the last to raise the banner of strife, never the first to lay it down, never laid it down until his enemies were prostrate at his feet. Both Jews and Christians in Alexandria had so far departed from the primitive habits of their religion, that their most frequent and

Cyril's persecutions.
The Novatians.

The Jews.

^a καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρείας, παρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς γάξεως καταδυναστεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν. Socrat. H. E.

vii. 7.

^a Ibid. loc. cit.

^b διχα γὰρ αἵματος οὐ παύεται τῆς ὕμνης. Socrat. vii. 13.

dangerous collisions took place in the theatre; and the drama, in its noblest form a part of the pagan religion, had now degenerated into such immodest or savage exhibitions, or in itself gave rise to such maddening factions that, instead of allaying hostile feelings by the common amusement and hilarity, it inflamed them to fiercer animosity.^c The contested merits of a pantomimic actor now exasperated the mutual hatred of the religious parties. Orestes, the prefect of the city, determined to suppress these tumults, and ordered strict police regulations to that effect to be hung up in the theatre. Certain partisans of the archbishop entered the theatre, with the innocent design, it is said, of reading this proclamation. Among these was one Hierax, a low schoolmaster, a man conspicuous as an admirer of Cyril, whom he was wont (according to common usage in the church) to applaud vehemently whenever he preached. From what cause is not quite clear, the Jews supposed themselves insulted by the presence of Hierax;^d they raised a violent outcry that the man was there only to stir up a tumult. Orestes, jealous, it is said, of the archbishop on account of his encroachments on the civil authority, sided with the Jews, ordered Hierax to be seized as a disturber of the peace, and publicly scourged. The archbishop sent for the principal Jews, and threatened them with exemplary vengeance, if they did not cause all tumults against the

^c These entertainments usually took place on the Jewish Sabbath, and on that idle day the theatre was thronged with Jews, who preferred this profane amusement to the holy worship of their Synagogue.—Hist. of Jews, iii. 34.

^d My suggestion, in a former work,

that these regulations might have appointed different days for the different races of the people to attend the theatre, would make the story more clear. The excuse which Socrates suggests for the presence of Hierax implies that he had no business there.

Christians to cease. The Jews determined to anticipate the menace of their adversaries. Having put on rings of palm bark, in order to distinguish each other in the dark, they suddenly, at the dead of night, raised a cry that the great church, called that of Alexander, was on fire. The Christians rose and rushed from all quarters to save the church. The Jews fell upon them and massacred on all sides. When day dawned, the cause of the uproar was manifest. The archbishop placed himself at the head of a formidable force, attacked the synagogue of the Jews, expelled the whole race, no doubt not without much bloodshed, from the city, and allowed the populace to pillage all their vast wealth. The Jews, who from the time of Alexander had inhabited the city, were thus cast forth naked and outraged from its walls. The strong part which Orestes took against the archbishop, and his regret at the expulsion of so many thriving and opulent Jews from the city, warrant the suspicion that their rising was not without great provocation. Both parties sent representations to the Emperor: in the interval Cyril was compelled by the people of Alexandria to make overtures of reconciliation.* On one occasion he went forth to meet Orestes with the Gospel in his hand: the prefect, probably supposing that he had not much of its spirit in his heart, refused his advances.

The monks of the Nitrian desert had already been employed in the persecutions by Theophilus. Monks of
Nitria. These fiery champions of the Church took arms to the number of five hundred, and poured into the city to strengthen the faction of the patriarch.

* τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ λαὸς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρίων αὐτὸν ποιεῖν κατηνάγκασεν
Socrat. loc. cit.

They surrounded the chariot of the prefect, insulted him, and heaped on him the opprobrious names of heathen and idolater. The prefect protested, but in vain, that he had been baptized by Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople. One of these monks, named Ammonius, hurled a great stone and struck him on the head; the blood gushed forth, and his affrighted attendants fled on all sides. But the character of Orestes stood high with the people. The Alexandrians rose in defence of their magistrate; the monks were driven from the city; Ammonius seized, tortured, and put to death. Cyril commanded his body to be taken up: the honours of Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian; his panegyric was pronounced in the Church, and he was named Thaumasius, the Wonderful. But the more Christian of the Christians were shocked at the conduct of the Archbishop. Cyril was for once ashamed, and glad to bury the affair in oblivion.

But before long his adherents were guilty of a more atrocious and an unprovoked crime, of the
Hypatia. guilt of which a deep suspicion attached to Cyril. All Alexandria respected, honoured, took pride in the celebrated Hypatia. She was a woman of extraordinary learning; in her was centred the lingering knowledge of that Alexandrian Platonism cultivated by Plotinus and his school. Her beauty was equal to her learning; her modesty commended both. She mingled freely with the philosophers without suspicion to her lofty and unblemished character. Hypatia lived in great intimacy with the prefect Orestes: the only charge whispered against her was that she encouraged him in his hostility to the patriarch. Cyril, on the other hand, is said not to have been superior to an unworthy jealousy at the greater concourse of hearers to the lectures of

the elegant Platonist than to his own sermons.^f Some of Cyril's ferocious partisans seized this woman, dragged her from her chariot, and with the most revolting indecency tore her clothes off, and then rent her limb from limb.^g The Christians of Alexandria did this, professing to be actuated by Christian zeal in the cause of a Christian prelate. No wonder, in the words of the ecclesiastical historian, that by such a deed a deep stain was fixed on Cyril and the Church of Alexandria.^h

It was this man who now stood forth as the head and representative of Eastern Christendom, the assertor of pure Christian doctrine, the antagonist of heresy on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. Cyril was not blind to the advantage offered by this opportunity of humiliating or crushing by this odious imputation the Bishop of the Imperial See, which aspired to dispute with Alexandria the primacy of the East. The patriarchs of Alexandria had seen the rise of Constantinople with undissembled jealousy. To this primacy Antioch, perhaps Jerusalem, might advance some pretensions. Ephesus boasted of her connexion with St. John. But Byzantium had been a poor see under the jurisdiction of Heraclea; its claim rested entirely on the city having become the seat of empire. This jealousy had been, no doubt, the latent cause of the bitter and persevering hostility of Theophilus towards Chrysostom. The more ambitious Cyril might now renew the contest with less suspicion of unworthy motives; he was waging war, not against a rival, but against a heretic.

^f Socrates, H. E. vii. 13.

^g Damascius apud Suidam.

^h τοῦτο οὐ μικρὸν μῶμον Κυρίλλῳ,

καὶ τῇ Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίᾳ
εἰργάσατο. Sociat. loc. cit.

The intelligence of the disturbances in Constantinople and the unpopular doctrines favoured at least by Nestorius spread rapidly to Alexandria: the monks of both regions probably maintained a close correspondence. Cyril commenced his operations by an Easter sermon, in which, without introducing the name of Nestorius, he denounced his doctrines. He followed up the blow with four epistles, at certain intervals: one addressed to his faithful partisans, the monks of Egypt; one to the Emperor; one to the Empress mother, the guardian of her son; the last to Nestorius himself. The address to the Emperor commences in an Oriental tone of adulation, the servility of which would have been as abhorrent to an ancient Roman as its impiety to a primitive Christian. The Emperor is the image of God upon earth: as the Divine Majesty fills heaven and awes the angels, so his serene dignity the earth, and is the source of all human happiness. This Emperor was the feeble boy, Theodosius II. To the Empresses, the mother and the sister of Theodosius, as more worthy auditors, and judges better qualified to enter on such high mysteries, Cyril pours out all the treasures of his theology. In the letter to Nestorius, who, it seems, had taken offence at the dissemination of the address to the Egyptian monks in Constantinople, Cyril states, with some calmness, that the whole Christian world, Rome, Syria, Alexandria, were equally shocked by the denial of the title "Mother of God" to the Blessed Virgin.¹ This epistle was followed by a second, which called forth an answer from Nestorius. This answer, as well as the whole of the controversy, more completely betrays the leading notions which had obtained such full possession

¹ Labbe, Concii. in. p. 51.

of the mind of Nestorius. The Godhead, as immaterial is essentially impassible. The co-eternal Word must be impassible, as the co-eternal Father.^k The human nature was the temple in which dwelt the serene and impassive Divinity. To degrade the Divinity to the brute and material processes of gestation, birth, passion, death, the inalienable accidents of the flesh and the flesh alone, was pure heathenism, or a heresy worse than that of Arius or Apollinaris. Cyril himself is driven by this difficulty to the very verge of Nestorian opinions, and to admit that the Godhead cannot properly be asserted to have suffered wounds and death.^m But throughout this age the strong repulsive power of religious difference subdues the feebler attractive force of conciliation and peace. The epistolary altercation between Cyril and Nestorius grew fiercer, and with less hope of reconciliation. Nestorius, though he might

^k καὶ τὸν θεῖον ἐκέινον τῶν πατέρων εὗρήσεις χορὸν, οὐ τὴν δημοσίον θεότητα παθητὴν εἰρήκοτα, οὐδὲ ἀναστᾶσαν τὸν τὸν λελυμένον ναὺν ἀναστήσαντα. Epist. Nestor., apud Labbe, p. 321. τὸν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἀπαθῆ κηρύχθεντα, καὶ δευτέρας γεννήσεως ἄδεκτον, πάλιν παθητὸν, καὶ νεκτικτὸν οὐκ ὀιδ' ὅπως εἴσηγεν, p. 322. This is throughout the point at issue. Compare the third part (in the Council. Labbe) containing the twelve chapters of Cyril, the objections of the Oriental prelates, and the apology of Cyril for each separate chapter. The one party contend against the passibility, the mutability of the Godhead; Christ being God, is ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος. The flesh, which endured all the passion and the change, was inti-

mately connected with the Deity; was its pavilion, its dwelling-place; and this may explain "The Word became Flesh." Compare pp. 844, 881, 892.

^m Cyril was reduced to the expression ἀπαθὼς ἔπαθε. We find, too, this remarkable passage: οὐχ ὅτι τῶς αὐτὸς δὲ θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἦθεῖς λόγος ἀπέθανεν, ἢ ἐνύχθη λόγῳ εἰς τὴν πλευράν, ποίαν γὰρ ἔχει, εἶπε μοι, πλευράν, τὸ ἀσώματον, ἢ πῶς ἂν ἀπέθανεν ἢ ζῶν; ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐνωθεὶς τῇ σαρκί, εἰτα πάσχουσης αὐτῆς, ὡς τοῦ ἰδίου πάσχοντος σώματος, αὐτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν οἰκειούται τὸ παθὸς. In the Alexandrian Liturgy of S. Gregory, this expression has been introduced, καὶ παθὼν ἑκουσίως σαρκί, καὶ μέλλας ἀπαθὴς ὡς θεός. Apud Renaudot, l. p. 114

not foresee the formidable confederacy which was organising itself against him, might yet have known on what dangerous ground he stood even in Constantinople. The clergy of both factions, who had engaged in the strife for the advancement of Philippus or of Proclus, the rivals of the ruling archbishop for the see, mutually indignant at the intrusion of a stranger, were already combined in hatred towards Nestorius. All the monks were furious partisans of the "Mother of God." Against this confederacy Nestorius could array only the precarious favour of the Emperor, the support of some of his Syrian brethren, his archiepiscopal authority, and the allegiance of some of his clergy. Nestorius rashly precipitated the strife. Dorotheus, a bishop of his party, in his presence pronounced a solemn anathema on all who should apply the contested appellation to the Virgin.ⁿ A fiery and injurious protest^o was immediately issued, professing to speak the sentiments of the whole clergy of Constantinople, and peremptorily condemning the bishop, as guilty of heresy, and comparing his language to the unpopular and proscribed opinions of Paul of Samosata. It was read in most of the churches.^p

Both parties, Nestorius and Cyril themselves, could not but look with earnest solicitude to Rome. She held the balance of power. If the Bishop of Rome had been the most unambitious of mankind, he could hardly have declined the arbitration, which

ⁿ The chronology of the events is not quite clear, but this seems to be the natural order.

^o This protest preserves some of the expressions attributed to Nestorius. 'How could a mother, born in time,

give birth to him who was before the ages?" The word "birth," it occurred to neither party, was used in directly opposite senses.

^p Compare the strong address of the monks to the Emperor, p. 225.

was almost an acknowledgment of his supremacy. Nothing tended more to his elevation in the mind of Christendom than these successive Eastern controversies, if considered only as affecting his dignity in the eyes of the world. The deeper the East was sunk in anarchy and confusion, the more commanding the stately superiority of Rome. While the episcopal throne of Constantinople had been held in succession by the persecuted Chrysostom, by the heretic Nestorius, as it was afterwards by Flavianus, who, if not murdered, died of ill usage in a council of bishops; that of Alexandria by Theophilus, and his nephew Cyril, whose violence disgraced their orthodoxy; a succession of able, at least blameless, Pontiffs of Rome was now about to close with Leo the Great.^a

Each, too, of these Eastern antagonists for ascendancy was disposed to admit one part of the claims on which rested the supremacy of Rome. Alexandria, that of the descent from St. Peter: ancient and apostolic origin was so clearly wanting to Constantinople, that on this point the Roman superiority was undeniable. On her side, Constantinople was content to recognise the title of Rome to superiority as the city of the Cæsars, from whence followed her own secondary, if not co-equal dignity as New Rome.

Celestine, of Roman birth, who had held high language to the Churches of Africa and of Gaul, at this present period was Bishop of Rome. Pope
Celestine.

Nestorius was the first who endeavoured to propitiate the Roman Pontiff. Some misunderstanding had already arisen between them concerning certain Pelagians, the only heretics whom Nestorius was slow to persecute

^a Not immediate succession, but the succession of the greater names.

and whom, as if ignorant how obnoxious they were to Rome and the West, he had treated with something of Eastern indifference. He addressed to Celestine a letter, fully explaining the grounds of his aversion to the term "Mother of God." This he wrote in Greek; it was sent into Gaul, to be correctly translated by the famous monk Cassianus.^r

In the mean time arrived the Deacon Posidonius from Alexandria, with an elaborate letter from Cyril,^s which, with the Sermons of Nestorius, he had the forethought to send already translated into Latin. Thus the hostile representations of Cyril, though delivered last, obtained the advantage of pre-occupying the minds of the Roman clergy.^t

To them, indeed, the Nestorian opinions were utterly uncongenial, as to the whole of Western Christendom. They had not comprehended and could not comprehend that sensitive dread of the contamination of the Deity by its connexion with Matter: they were equally jealous of any disparagement of the Virgin Mary. Already her name, with the title of Mother of God, had sounded in hymns ascribed to St. Ambrose, and admitted into the public service. The Latin language was not flexible to all the fine shades of expression by which Nestorius defined his distinctive differences from the common creed.

Still Nestorius was not entirely without hope of ob-

^r Celestinus ad Nestorium. Walch rather throws doubt on this translation by Cassian, p. 433.

^s Posidonius was instructed not to deliver the letters of Cyril, if those of Nestorius had not been delivered to Celestine. — Statement of Peter the

Presbyter, Council. Ephes. in init.

^t Nestorius bitterly complained of the misrepresentations of Cyril in this letter, by which he deceived Celestine, a man of too great simplicity to judge of religious doctrines with sufficient acuteness. — Irenæi Traged. in Synodic.

taining a favourable hearing from Celestine. The first reply of the Roman was not devoid of courtesy. But his hopes were in a short time utterly confounded. A synod of Western Bishops, presided over by Celestine, met at Rome. The sentence was decisive, condemnatory, imperious. Celestine, in the name of the Synod, and in his own,^a commanded Nestorius to recant his novel and unauthorised opinions in a public and written apology within ten days from the arrival of the monition: in case of disobedience, he was to hold himself under excommunication from the Church.*

A.D. 430.
August.

Mandate of
Celestine.

Aug. 11.

This haughty mandate to Nestorius was accompanied by an address to the clergy and people of Constantinople. It expressed the parental care of Celestine for their spiritual welfare, and announced the decree which had been issued against Nestorius by the Bishop of Rome. The Western Church would take no account of any anathema or excommunication pronounced by the Bishop of Constantinople; but having declared such anathema null and void, would continue to communicate with all persons under such interdict. And because the presence of Celestine in the East, however necessary, was impossible, on account of the distance by land and sea, he delegated his full power in the affair to his brother Cyril, in order to arrest the spreading pestilence.^y

The Syrian bishops alone, of those who, from their

^a φανερά καὶ ἐγγράφῳ δμολογία.
p. 361.

^x Epist. Cyrill. p. 396.

^y καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐν τηλικούτῳ πράγματι ἡ ἡμετέρα σχεδὸν παρουσία ἀναγκαία ἐφαίνετο, τὴν ἡμετέραν

διαδοχὴν, διὰ τὰ κατὰ θαλάτταν καὶ γῆν διαστήματα, αὐτῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀδελφῷ μου Κυρίλλῳ ἀπενείμαμεν, μὴ αὐτῇ ἡ νόσος ἀφορμὴ τῆς μακρότητος ἐπιτριβῇ. Epist. Cyrill. p. 373.

station and character, had weight in the Christian world, were yet uncommitted in the strife, Acacius of Bishops of Syria. Berea, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Antioch. Each party courted their support. Cyril, with his usual activity, urged them to unite in the confederacy against Nestorius. Either from the sincere love of peace, or some clearer perception of the principles on which Nestorius grounded his opinions, or some secret sympathy with them, these bishops endeavoured to allay the storm. John of Antioch, in a letter full of Christian persuasiveness, entreated Nestorius not to plunge Christendom into discord on account of a word, and that word not incapable of being interpreted in his sense, but which had become familiar to the Christian ear: Rome, Alexandria, even Macedonia, had declared against him. John required no degrading concession, no disingenuous compromise or suppression of opinion. If his enemies were strong and violent before the correspondence had begun with Rome and Alexandria, how would their boldness increase after these unhappy letters² from Cyril and from Celestine! But the time for reconciliation was passed. Four

Celestine s
ευρύς In
Constanti-
nople.

bishops, Theopemptus, Daniel, Potamon, and Komarius, arrived in Constantinople, with the ultimate demands of Rome and Alexandria. They entered, after divine service, the Bishop's chamber, where were assembled the whole clergy, and many of the most distinguished laity; they delivered the letters to Nestorius. Nestorius received them coldly, and commanded them to return the next day for the answer.

² γραμμάτων τούτων τῶν ἀπευκ-
τῶν. Epist. Joan. Antioch. p. 393.
Nestorius, had almost consented to yield
so far as to assert that it was no, so

much the word itself as the abuse of it
which was irreconcilable with his
views on the Godhead.

The next day when they presented themselves, they were refused admission.* Nestorius ascended the pulpit, and preached in sterner and more condemnatory language than before. Celestine and Cyril had demanded unqualified submission; Cyril had declared that it was not enough to subscribe the Creed of Nicæa, without receiving the sense of that Creed according to the interpretation of the Bishops of the Church. The twelve articles of excommunication were promulgated, by the zeal of the Bishop's adversaries, throughout Constantinople. But Nestorius, unappalled, on his side launched forth his interdict; anathema encountered anathema. Nestorius excluded from salvation those who denied salvation to him. For in the awful meaning which the act of excommunication conveyed to the Christian mind of that age, it meant total exclusion, unless after humiliating penitence, and hard-wrung absolution, from the mercy of the Most High,—inevitable, everlasting damnation.

Nestorius
excommuni-
cated, Dec. 6,
430.

With stern serenity the enemies of Nestorius contemplate these awful consequences; those of worldly strife they behold almost with satisfaction. Cyril applies to these times the much misused words of the Saviour, —“*Think not that I am come to send peace upon earth; for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother.*” If faith be infringed—faith even in these minutest points—away with idle and dangerous reverence for parents; cast off all love of children and of brethren. Death is better than life to the pious (those who adhere to the orthodox opinions), for to them alone is the better resurrection.^b

* The account of this transaction is given by the bishops Theopemptus

and the rest.

^b πίστεως γὰρ ἀδικουμένης * *

The anathemas of Nestorius are not less remorseless. They also aim at involving Cyril in the odious charge of heresy. Throughout is manifest the peculiar jealousy of Nestorius lest he should mingle up the Deity in any way with the material flesh of man. Christ was the Emmanuel, the God with us. The Divinity assumed at his birth the mortal form and attributes, and so became the Christ, the co-existent God and man. The Christ laid aside the manhood, which he had associated to his divinity, after his death and resurrection. Accursed is he who asserts that the Word of God was changed into flesh. Accursed is he who disparages the dignity of the divine nature by attributing to it the acts and passions of the human nature which it assumed for the display of its Godhead.*

The secret of the undaunted courage shown by Nestorius was soon revealed. He had still unshaken possession of the mind of the Imperial Court. The triumph of Cyril was arrested by an humiliating rescript from Theodosius. He was arraigned not merely for disturbing the peace of the world, but even that of the Imperial family. The rescript addressed to Cyril, in unambiguous language, relates his haughty and dictatorial demeanour, reproves him as the author of all the strife and confusion which disturbed the tranquillity of the Church. In order to sow dissension even in the palace, Cyril had written in different language to his

ἐρρέτω μὲν ὡς ἔωλος καὶ ἐπισφαλὴς ἡ πρὸς γονέας αἰδώς· ἡρεμείτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τῆς εἰς τέκνα καὶ ἀδελφοὺς φιλοστοργίας νόμος. Cyril. Epist. p. 396.

* The anathemas of Nestorius are extant only in a bad Latin translation. It is curious to find the Syrian bishop,

Acacius, urging that the poverty of the Latin language prevented it from forming expressions with regard to the Trinity equivalent to the Greek. τῷ ἐστενωῶσθαι τὴν Ῥωμαικὴν φωνὴν καὶ μὴ δυνατόν εἶναι πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν τῶν Γραικῶν φρασὶν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις λέγειν. Epist. Acac. p. 384.

august sister Pulcheria, and to the Empress, and himself. The same curious, restless, insolent, and unpriestly spirit had led him to pry into the secrets and disturb the harmony of the Imperial family, as well as to confound the quiet of the Church, as though this confusion were his only means of obtaining fame and distinction.^a

Theodosius had already acceded to the universal demand for a General Council. This alone, according to the opinion of the time, could allay the intestine strife which had set Rome and Alexandria at variance with Constantinople, divided Constantinople into fierce and violent factions, and appeared likely to renew the fatal differences of the Arian and Macedonian contests. The Imperial summons was issued, and in obedience to that mandate assembled the first General Council of Ephesus.

It might have been supposed that nowhere would Christianity appear in such commanding majesty as in a Council, which should gather from all quarters of the world the most eminent prelates and the most distinguished clergy; that a lofty and serene piety would govern all their proceedings, profound and dispassionate investigation exhaust every subject; human passions and interests would stand rebuked before that awful assembly; the sense of their own dignity as well as the desire of impressing their brethren with the solemnity and earnestness of their belief would at least exclude all intemperance of manner

^a καὶ μὴ γεγονὸς (hostility in the Imperial family) ποιῆσαι βούλεσθαι, παντὸς, μᾶλλον ἢ ἱερεῶς· ὀρυμνῆς μέντοι μίᾱς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεοῦ ἕως τὰ τε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, τὰ τε τῶν βασιλέων μέλλειν χωρίζειν βούλεσθαι, ὡς οὐκ οὐσης ἀφορμῆς ἐτέραις εὐδοκίμησεως. Sier. Theodos. Imper. ad Cyrill.

and language. Mutual awe and mutual emulation in Christian excellence would repress, even in the most violent, all un-Christian violence. Their conclusions would be grave, mature, harmonious, for if not harmonious the confuted party would hardly acquiesce in the wisdom of their decrees; even their condemnations would be so tempered with charity as gradually to win back the wanderer to the still open fold, rather than driving him, proscribed and branded, into inflexible and irreconcilable schism. History shows the melancholy reverse. Nowhere is Christianity less attractive, and if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, less authoritative, than in the Councils of the Church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction. Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than after sober inquiry, detract from the reverence, and impugn the judgements, at least of the later Councils. The close is almost invariably a terrible anathema, in which it is impossible not to discern the tones of human hatred, of arrogant triumph, of rejoicing at the damnation imprecated against the humiliated adversary. Even the venerable Council of Nicæa commenced with mutual accusals and recriminations, which were suppressed by the moderation of the Emperor; and throughout the account of Eusebius^e there is an adulation of the Imperial convert, with something of the intoxication, it might be of pardonable vanity, at finding themselves the objects of royal favour, and partaking in royal banquets. But the more fatal

^e Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 440.

error of that Council was the solicitation, at least the acquiescence in the infliction of a civil penalty, that of exile, against the recusant Prelates. The degeneracy is rapid from the Council of Nicæa to that of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use every means of haste, manœuvre, court influence, bribery, to crush his adversary; where there was an encouragement of, if not an appeal to, the violence of the populace, to anticipate the decrees of the Council; where each had his own tumultuous foreign rabble to back his quarrel; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas through persecution by the civil government.

Some considerations will at least allay our wonder at this singular incongruity. A General Council is not the cause, but the consequence, of religious dissension. It is unnecessary, and could hardly be convoked, but on extraordinary occasions, to settle some questions which have already violently disorganised the peace of Christendom. It is a field of battle, in which a long train of animosities and hostilities is to come to an issue. Men, therefore, meet with all the excitement, the estrangement, the jealousy, the antipathy engendered by a fierce and obstinate controversy. They meet to triumph over their adversaries, rather than dispassionately to investigate truth. Each is committed to his opinions, each exasperated by opposition, each supported by a host of intractable followers, each probably with exaggerated notions of the importance of the question; and that importance seems to increase, since it has demanded the decision of a general assembly of Christendom. Each considers the cause of God in his hands: heresy becomes more and more odious, and must be suppressed by every practicable means. The

essentially despotic character of the government, which entered into all transactions of life, with the deeply rooted sentiment in the human mind of the supreme and universal power of the law, the law now centred in the person of the Emperor, who was the State; the apparent identification of the State and Church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction. The dominant party, when it could obtain the support of the civil power for the execution of its intolerant edicts, was blind to the dangerous and unchristian principle which it tended to establish. As the Council met under the Imperial authority, so it seemed to commit the Imperial authority to enforce its decisions. Christianity, which had so nobly asserted its independence of thought and faith in the face of heathen emperors, threw down that independence at the foot of the throne, in order that it might forcibly extirpate the remains of Paganism, and compel an absolute uniformity of Christian faith.

Meeting of
Council, A. D.
431. Easter,
April 19;
Whit-Sun-
day, June 7.

The Council of Ephesus was summoned to open its deliberations at Pentecost; the fifty days from Easter were allowed for the assembling of the Prelates.

Candidianus, Count of the domestics, a statesman of high character, was appointed to represent the Emperor in the Council. His instructions were, not to interfere in the theological question, the exclusive province of the Bishops; to expel all strangers, monks and laymen, from the city, lest they should disturb the proceedings; to maintain order, lest the animosities of the Bishops should prevent the fair investigation of the truth; to permit no one to leave the Council, even under pretence of going to the Court; to permit no extraneous

discussions to be introduced before the assembly. Candidianus did not arrive till after Pentecost.

Already, however, Ephesus had begun to be crowded with strangers from all quarters. Nestorius came accompanied by not more than sixteen Bishops of his party. Cyril arrived attended by fifty Egyptian Bishops; Memnon, the Bishop of Ephesus, a declared enemy of Nestorius, had summoned thirty Prelates from Asia Minor. Nor were these antagonists content with mustering their spiritual strength; each was accompanied by a rabble of followers of more unseemly character; Cyril by the bath-men and a multitude of women from Egypt; Nestorius by a horde of peasants, and some of the lower populace of Constantinople. The troops of Candidianus, after his arrival, begirt the city; Irenæus, with a body of soldiers, was entrusted, by the special favour of the Emperor, with the protection of the person of Nestorius.

The adverse parties could not await the opening of the Council without betraying their hostility; skirmishing disputes took place,^f and no opportunity was passed of darkening the fame and the opinions of Nestorius in the popular mind. If Nestorius came under the fond hope of being heard on equal terms, and allowed to debate in a calm and dispassionate spirit the truth of his tenets, such were not the views of Cyril or of Celestine. To them the Bishop of Constantinople was already a condemned heretic; the business of the

^f ἀκροβολίσμους τῶν λόγων. So-
crat. vii. 34. Joanne Antiocheno
remorante * * * Cyrillus deflorationes
quasdam librorum Nestorii faciebat,
eum perturbare volens. Et quum
plurimi Deum confiteantur Jesum
Christum, ego, inquit Nestorius, qui

fuit duorum vel trium mensium nun-
quam confiteor Deum; quâ gratiâ
mundus sum a sanguine vestro, et am-
modo ad vos non veniam. Liberatus,
Chron. c 5. This is a good illustration
of the Latin misconception of the
opinions of Nestorius.

Council was only the confirmation of their anathema, and the more authoritative deposition of the unorthodox Prelate. With them the one embarrassing difficulty was whether, in case Nestorius recanted his opinions, they were to annul the sentence of excommunication and of deposal, and admit him to a seat in the Council.^g

Memnon of Ephesus lent himself eagerly to all the schemes of Cyril. Nestorius was treated as a man under the ban of excommunication; all intercourse, even the common courtesies of life were refused. All the Churches of Ephesus were closed against the outcast from Christian communion. When he expressed his solicitude, if not to attend the morning and evening service, at least to partake in the solemn mysteries of that season, not merely was he ignominiously repelled from the churches, even from *that of the Martyr St. John*, but the avenues were beset by throngs of rude peasants brought in from the country, and prepared for any violence, and by the Egyptian sailors from the vessels of Cyril.^h

Pentecost had passed; five days after arrived Juvenalis, Bishop of Jerusalem, a Prelate known to be hostile to Nestorius. But John of Antioch, with the greater part of the Eastern Bishops did not appear. The Patriarchs of Constantinople and of Alexandria were arrayed as parties in the cause: each

^g *Etenim quæris utrum sancta synodus recipere debet hominem a se prædicatam damnantem; an quia induciarum tempus emensum est, sententia dudum lata perduret.* This is from an answer to a letter of Cyril which is lost. Celestine's reply to this question is perhaps studiously ambiguous. But the letter, as extant, is

probably a translation. The secret instructions of Celestine to his legates (apud Baluzium, p. 381) show his intimate alliance with Cyril.—Labbe, Conc. p. 622. Compare Walch, p. 466.

^h Epist. Nestorii, p. 565. Epist. ad Imber. p. 602. Epist. ad Senat. 603.

charged the other with heresy. The Roman Patriarch of the West was not present in person: the Patriarch of Antioch therefore might seem necessary, if not to the validity, to the weight and dignity of the Council. Cyril and his partisans were clamorous for the immediate opening of the Council; the Bishops had been already too long withdrawn from their dioceses. Nestorius insisted on awaiting the arrival of John of Antioch and his prelates; Candidianus gave the weight of the Imperial authority for delay. The Emperor had required the presence of John of Antioch and the Eastern Prelates at the Council.¹ Strong reasons were afterwards alleged by John of Antioch for his tardy arrival. His departure from Antioch had been arrested by a famine in the city, and daily insurrections of the people on that account; inundations had impeded his march.² Many of the Bishops of his vast province were ten or twelve long days' journey beyond Antioch; they could not leave their cities before Easter.³ Cyril himself had received a courteous letter from John of Antioch, stating that he had arrived within six stations of Ephesus; that he was travelling with the utmost speed; that the roads were bad; they had lost many of their beasts of burden; and some of the more aged Bishops had been unable to proceed at that rapid rate.

Cyril, however, chose to consider the delay of the Bishop of Antioch intentional and premeditated, either in order to shield the guilty Nestorius from the anathema of the Council, or to escape any participation in

¹ Defens. trium Capitular. Facundus, apud Simond. Opera, ii. p. 607.

the Emperor.

³ Evagrius, H. E. i. 3, 4. Labbe

² The epistle of John of Antioch to Council. p. 443.

such a sentence against one so well known, and formerly at least so popular, in Antioch."

Only sixteen days were allowed to elapse by the im-
 Opening of Council, Monday, June 22. patient zeal (the noblest motive that can be assigned) of Cyril for the opening a Council which was to represent Christendom, to absolve or to condemn as an irreclaimable heretic the Bishop of the second capital of the world. On Monday the 22nd of June, in the Church of the Virgin Mary (an ill-omened scene for the cause of Nestorius), met the Council of Ephesus.*

The Count Candidianus, in a public report to his Imperial master, describes the violence, unbusiness, even the treachery of the proceedings. No sooner had he heard that Cyril, Memnon, and their partisans were prepared to open the assembly, than he hastened to the Church. In the Emperor's name, he inhibited the meeting; he condescended to entreaties that they would await the arrival of the Eastern Bishops; he declared that they were acting in defiance of the Imperial Rescript. They answered that they were ignorant of the contents of that ordinance. Thus compelled, and lest he should be the cause of popular insurrection, and rebellion, Candidianus read the Rescript; and concluded

* Cyril's imputations against John of Antioch are inconsistent and contradictory. In one place he charges him with hypocrisy, and insinuates that he kept aloof to favour Nestorius (if the partisan of Nestorius, his presence would have been more useful than his absence); in another that, conscious of the badness of the cause of Nestorius, he kept aloof to avoid taking any part in his inevitable condemnation: "Do what you will ($\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ &

$\pi\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon$), only let me not be personally involved in the business." Compare Cyril's Letter to the Clergy of Constantinople, p. 561, with the Epistol. imper., p. 602.

* The effect of this arrangement may be conceived from the Sermon of Cyril (Labbe, p. 584), in which he lavishes all his eloquence in her praise, through whom ($\delta\iota'$ $\eta\varsigma$) all the wonders and blessings of the Gospel which he recites, descended on man.

by solemnly warning them against their indecent precipitation. This was their object; the reading the Rescript they considered as legalising the Council; it was followed by loud and loyal clamours. The Count fondly supposed that these cries intimated obedience to the Imperial command; instead of this, they instantly commanded Candidianus to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any place; insultingly and ignominiously they cast out the representative of the Emperor.* They proceeded summarily to eject the few Bishops attached to Nestorius; and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom.^p

The council consisted of rather more than one hundred and fifty bishops—about forty from Egypt, thirty from Asia Minor, several from Palestine with Juvenalis of Jerusalem, the rest from Thrace, Greece, the islands of Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus, and from some parts of Asia. Rufus of Thessalonica professed to represent the bishops of Illyricum.^q The proceedings, according to the regular report, now that all opposition was expelled, flowed on in unobstructed haste and unprecedented harmony. Peter, an Alexandrian presbyter, who acted as chief secretary,^r opened the business with a statement of the dispute between Nestorius on the one hand, Cyril and the Bishop of Rome on the other. On the motion of Juvenal of Jerusalem was then read the Imperial convocation of the bishops. It was asked how long a period had elapsed since the day appointed by the Emperor

^p See the statement of Candidianus, pp. 589-592. In another place he says, "A vobis injuniosè et ignominiosè ejectus sum."—In Synodico.

^q According to Nestorius, not only

the Eastern bishops were expected, but those of Italy and Sicily.

^r *πριμικληρος Νοταριων*. *Præmucenus Notariorum*.

for the meeting; Memnon of Ephesus replied "sixteen days." Cyril then rose, and asserting that on account of the long delay (of sixteen days!) some bishops had fallen ill, and some had died, declared that it was imperative to proceed at once to determine a question which concerned the whole sublunary world.* The Imperial Rescript itself had commanded the prelates to proceed without delay.

One citation had been already sent by four bishops, summoning Nestorius to appear before the council. Nestorius had declined, not uncourt-
Citation of Nestorius. teously, to acknowledge the validity of the assembly before the arrival of all the bishops. A second and a third deputation of the same number of bishops was sent. The first reported that they were not permitted by the guard to approach the presence of Nestorius, but received from his attendants the same answer; the third that they were exposed to the indignity of being kept standing in the heat of the sun, and not allowed to enter the palace.

The proceedings now commenced: the Nicene Creed
Proceedings commence. was read, and then Cyril's letter to Nestorius. The bishops in succession declared their full faith in the creed, and the perfect concordance of Cyril's exposition with the doctrines of the Nicene Fathers. Then followed the answer of Nestorius to Cyril. Cyril put the question of its agreement with the creed of Nicæa. One after another the bishops rose, and in language more or less vehement, pronounced the tenets of Nestorius to be blasphemous, and uttered the stern anathema. All then joined in one tumultuous cry, "Anathema to him who does not anathematise Nes-

* εἰς ὠφέλειον ἀπάσης τῆς ὑπ' εὐανου. p. 453.

torius." The church rang with the fatal and re-echoed word, "Anathema, anathema." The whole world unites in the excommunication: anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!

The triumph of Cyril ceased not here. The condemnatory letters of Celestine of Rome to Nestorius were read and inserted in the acts of the council. Certain bishops averred that of their personal knowledge Nestorius had not retracted his obnoxious doctrines. Then were read extracts from the works of the great theologians, Athanasius, Gregory, Basil, and others; many of these were of very doubtful bearing on the question raised by Nestorius; they were contrasted with large extracts from his writings. A letter was read from Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, excusing the absence of the African clergy on account of the miserable desolation and the wars which afflicted the province, asserting in general terms their cordial adherence to the Catholic doctrine, and their abhorrence of heretical innovations.

The Council, it is said, compelled by the sacred canons and amid the tears of many bishops, proceeded to deliver its awful sentence;† Jesus Christ himself, blasphemed by Nestorius (so ran the decree), declares him deposed from his episcopal rank, and from all his ecclesiastical functions. All the bishops subscribed the sentence." The whole of this solemn discussion, with its fearful conclusion, was crowded into one day! The impatient populace had been waiting from morn till evening the issue of the Council. No sooner had they heard the deposition of this new Judas.

† ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες ὑπὸ | Ἐννοία ὅτι ἄνωθεν δύο ἑκατὶ ὀνόματα ἐμφα-
 τε τῶν κανόνων * * * δακρύσαντες | Ἐννοία ὅτι ἄνωθεν δύο ἑκατὶ ὀνόματα ἐμφα-
 πολλὰκις * * * σκυθρωπὴν ἀπό- | Ἐννοία ὅτι ἄνωθεν δύο ἑκατὶ ὀνόματα ἐμφα-
 φασιν. Labbe, p. 533.

than they broke out into joyous clamours; escorted the Prelates with torches to their homes; women went before them burning incense. A general illumination took place. Thus did the Saviour, writes Cyril, proudly recounting these popular suffrages, show his Almighty power against those who blasphemed his name.^x

Five days after arrived John of Antioch, and the Eastern Prelates; they were received with great honour by Count Candidianus, by the other bishops not only with studied discourtesy, but with tumultuous and disorderly insult.^y Nestorius kept aloof in judicious seclusion. These Prelates proceeded to instal themselves as a Council, under the sanction of the Imperial Commissary. Their first inquiry was whether the former Council had been conducted with canonical regularity, and the sentence passed after dispassionate investigation. Candidianus bore testimony to the indecent haste and precipitation of the decree. But instead of calmly protesting against these violent proceedings, and declaring them null and void, as wanting their own concurrent voice, this small synod of between forty and fifty bishops,^z rushed into the error which they had proscribed in others! with no calmer or longer inquiry, before they had shaken the dust off their feet,^a they condemned the doctrines of Cyril, as tainted with Arianism, Eunomianism, and Apollinarianism; pronounced the sentence of deposition against the

^x Cyril's letter to the people of Alexandria, had refused to take part in the council. Their adversaries assert that some of

^y Compare, however, the statement of Memnon, a suspicious witness, p. 763.

^z These bishops did not all come with John; some were of those previously assembled at Ephesus, who

them were deprived bishops, others not bishops at all. According to this statement John's party did not amount to more than thirty.—Epist. Cyril. et Memnon. p. 638.

^a Cyril, Epist. ad Celestin. p. 663.

most religious Cyril (ecclesiastical courtesy held this appellation inseparable from that of bishop) and against Memnon of Ephesus; and recorded their solemn anathema against the Prelates of the adverse Council.^b The sentence condemned not their heresy alone, but likewise their disobedience to the Imperial authority, and their impious violence in excluding the faithful from the holy ceremonies of Pentecost, their closing the churches, and besetting them with gangs of Egyptian sailors and ecclesiastics, and with Asiatic boors. The excommunication was published throughout the city with the solemnity of an Imperial proclamation. Cyril and Memnon launched a counter-anathema; and instead of abstaining, as excommunicated persons, from the sacred offices, celebrated them with greater pomp and publicity.

In the mean time letters arrived from the Bishop of Rome, Celestine. Cyril's council reassembled July 10, Letters of Celestine. to receive them; every sentence was in such full accordance with their views, that the whole assembly rose in acclamation. "The council renders thanks to the second Paul, Celestine; to the second Paul, Cyril; to Celestine, protector of the faith; to Celestine, unanimous with the council. One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith in the whole council, one faith throughout the world."^c The Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, with Philip the Presbyter, the legates of Rome, gave their deliberate sanction to the deposition of Nestorius. At another sitting it was reported that endeavours had been made to bring John of Antioch, now accused as an accomplice in the guilt and heresy of Nestorius, to an amicable conference. Three bishops, deputed to him,

^b Labbe, Concil. 599.

^c Actio Secunda Concilii, p. 618.

had been repelled by the fierce and turbulent soldiery who guarded his residence. A second deputation had been admitted to his presence: he loftily refused to enter into negotiations with excommunicated persons. On this report the council proceeded to annul all the decrees of John and his synod. Having thrice cited him to appear they declared John of Antioch deposed and excommunicated, as well as all the bishops of his party.^d Cyril was not idle in his more public sphere of influence. He thundered from the pulpit against the bold man who had interfered in his triumphant conflict with the dragon of heresy, which vomited out its poison against the Church; he asserted that he was ready to encounter this new Goliath with the arms of faith.^e

Both parties were disposed to employ weapons of a more worldly temper. John of Antioch threatened the election of a new Bishop of Ephesus, in the place of the deprived Memnon.^f A peaceful band of worshippers according to one account, more probably an armed host, determined to force their way into the cathedral of St. John. They found it beset by Memnon with a strong garrison. Content, according to their own partial statement, with worshipping without the doors, they were retreating in peace, when the partisans of Memnon made a desperate sally, took men and horses prisoners, assailed them, and drove them through

^d The Bishop of Jerusalem claimed jurisdiction, as of ancient usage, over the see of Antioch.—p. 642.

^e ἐπῆρεν, ὡς ὁρᾷς, ὁ πολυκέφαλος δράκων τὴν ἀνύσιον καὶ βέβηλον κεφαλὴν, τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις τὸν τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοσιότητος ἰδὺν ἐπιπτόων. "This Goliath from the

East shall fall by stones from the scrip of Christ: and what is the scrip of Christ? the Church, which contains many stones, elect and precious." This is a specimen of the Archbishop's religious rhapsody. Honul. Cyril. p. 667.

^f Labbe, p. 710.

the streets with clubs and stones, not without much bloodshed.^g

The court of Theodosius was perplexed with the contradictory and doubtful reports from Ephesus. Candidianus and the party of Nestorius ^{Constantinople.} jealously watched the issues of the city, that no representations from Cyril and his council should reach the imperial ear. Theodosius still maintained his impartiality, or more probably a minister favourable to Nestorius ruled in the court. An imperial letter arrived, written in the interval between the deposition of Nestorius and the arrival of John of Antioch,^h strongly reproving the proceedings of the council, annulling all its decrees, commanding the reconsideration of the creed by the whole assembly, forbidding any bishop to leave Ephesus till the close of the council, and announcing the appointment of a second commissary to assist the Count Candidianus. But all the watchfulness of the government and of Nestorius could not intercept the secret correspondence of Cyril's party with their faithful allies, the earliest and most inveterate enemies of Nestorius, the monks of Constantinople. A beggar brought a letter announcing to them the glad tidings of the deposition of Nestorius, which the court had not condescended to communicate to the people. The court must be overawed; these spiritual demagogues would not await the tardy and doubtful orthodoxy of the Emperor.

Dalmatius, a monk of high repute for his austere sanctity, who, it is said, had in vain been solicited by the Emperor himself to quit his cell and intercede for

^g Their own despatches urged, and no doubt exaggerated, the contempt of the imperial authority, the lawlessness of the rabble at the command of Cyril

and of Memnon.

^h It was sent in great haste, by the imperial officer, Palladius.

the city during an earthquake, now, compelled by this more weighty call, came forth from his solitude. A vision had confirmed his sense of the imperious necessity. At the head of a procession of archimandrites and monks he passed slowly through the streets and sat down, as it were, to besiege the palace. Wherever he passed, the awed and wondering people burst out into an anathema against Nestorius.

But the court did not as yet stoop from its lofty dictatorship in ecclesiastical affairs. A new Emperor's rescripts. Imperial Commissary, one of the highest officers of state, named John, appeared in Ephesus. His first measure was one of bold and severe impartiality, a vigorous assertion of the civil supremacy, humiliating to the pride of sacerdotal dignity. The Imperial letters sanctioned equally the decrees of each conflicting party, the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, as well as of Nestorius. John summoned all the Prelates to his presence. At the dawn of morning appeared Nestorius with John of Antioch. Somewhat later, Cyril presented himself with the bishops of his party; Memnon alone refused to come. Hereupon arose a clamorous debate. Cyril and his bishops would not endure the presence of the heretical and excommunicated Nestorius. The divine and awful letters could not be read either in the absence of Cyril, or in the presence of Nestorius. The party of Nestorius and John as peremptorily demanded the expulsion of the deposed and excommunicated Cyril. The debate maddened into sedition, sedition into a battle. The Imperial Representative was compelled to use his military force to restrain the refractory churchmen, before he could read the Emperor's letters. At the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon, the clamours broke out with fresh

violence. John, the Prefect, took a commanding tone; he ordered the arrest and committal to safe but honourable custody of all the contending Prelates. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted without remonstrance. Cyril, after a homily to the people, in which he represented himself as the victim of persecution, incurred by Apostolic innocence and borne with Apostolic resignation, yielded to the inevitable necessity. Menon at first concealed himself, and attempted to elude apprehension, but at length voluntarily surrendered to the Imperial authority.

The throne was besieged, and confused by strong representations on both sides. At length it was determined that eight deputies for each party should be permitted to approach the court, and stand before the sacred presence of the Emperor. In Constantinople this assembly might cause dangerous tumults: they met therefore in the suburb of Chalcedon. On the side of Cyril appeared Philip the Presbyter Council of Chalcedon. the representative of Pope Celestine, and the Western Bishop Arcadius, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavianus of Philippi, Firmus of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, Acacius of Melitene, Theodotus of Ancyra, Euoptyus of Ptolemais. On that of the Orientals, the Metropolitans John of Antioch, John of Damascus, Himerius of Nicomedia; the Bishops Paul of Emesa, Macarius of Laodicea, Apringius of Chalcis, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Helladius of Ptolemais. Though the Bishop of Chalcedon endeavoured to close the churches on the Oriental Bishops, and the fanatic Monks from Constantinople threatened to stone them,ⁱ the people, according to their statement,

ⁱ "Nam Constantinopoli neque nos, sumus, propter seditiones *bonorum* mo-
neque adversarii nostri intrare permisi nachorum."—Epist. Oriental. p. 732

listened with absorbed interest to the eloquence of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and to the mild exhortations of John of Antioch. The youthful Emperor himself, when they taunted the adverse doctrine with degrading the Godhead to a passible being, rent his robes at the blasphemy.^k The Oriental Bishops gradually began to separate the cause of Nestorius from their own. They insisted much more on the heresy of Cyril than on the orthodoxy of Nestorius. They accused Cyril of asserting that the Godhead of the only begotten Son of God suffered, not the Manhood.^m They protested that they would rather die than subscribe the twelve chapters of Cyril, in which the anti-Nestorian doctrine had now taken a determinate form; or communicate with a Prelate deposed by their legitimate authority.

Other influences were now at work at the court of Constantinople. The masculine but ascetic mind of Pulcheria, the sister, the guardian, the Empress, she may be called, of the Emperor, with her rigid devotion to orthodoxy and her monastic character, was not likely to swerve from the dominant feeling of the Church; to comprehend the fine Oriental Spiritualism which would keep the Deity absolutely aloof from all intercourse with matter, as implied in his passibility: least of all, to endure any impeachment on the Mother of God, the tutelar Deity, and the glory of her sex. The power of the Virgin in the Court of Heaven was a precedent for that of holy females in the

^k See the short but curious statement in Latin:—"Passibilem esse deitatem. Quod usque adeo gravatim tulit pius rex noster, ut excuteret pallium, et retrorsum cederet prae blasphemiae multitudine."—p. 716.

^m ὡς ἡ θεότης τοῦ μονογενοῦς Θεοῦ υἱοῦ ἔπαθε, καὶ οὐκ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης. This they considered nearly allied to Arianism, as making the Son a created being. See the full view of their tenets in the Epist. Oriental. p. 740.

courts of earth. To the Virgin Empress, in later times, the gratitude of the triumphant party of Cyril and of the West attributed the glory of the degradation and banishment of Nestorius, and the discomfiture and dispersion of his followers. Still later, the Pope Leo addresses her as having expelled the crafty enemy from the Church: and her name was constantly saluted in the streets of Constantinople as the enemy of heretics.^a

Nestorius was quietly abandoned by both parties. The secret of this change lies deeper in the recesses of the Imperial councils. The Eu- ^{Nestorius} ^{abandoned.} nuch minister, who had been his powerful supporter, died; he might, indeed, not long have enjoyed this treacherous favour, for the Eunuch had most impartially condescended to receive bribes from the opposite faction also. When the Emperor ordered his vast treasures to be opened, confiscated no doubt to the Imperial use, a receipt was found for many pounds of gold received from Cyril through Paul, his sister's son.^o

Nestorius was allowed the vain honour of a voluntary abdication. From Ephesus he was permitted to retire to a monastery at Antioch. This monastery, of St. Euprepus, had been the retreat of his early youth; he returned to it, having endured all the vicissitudes of promotion and degradation. There he lived in peace and respect for four years.

Cyril in the mean time had escaped or had been permitted to withdraw from the custody of the Imperial officers at Ephesus. He returned ^{Cyril in} ^{Alexandria.} to Alexandria, where he was received in triumph as

^a "Quo dudum subdolum sanctæ religionis hostem, ab ipsis visceribus ecclesiæ depulstis, quæ hæresin suam tuæ impietas Nestoriana non potuit."

—S. Leon. Epist. 59.

^o Epist. Acacii Beroëns. ad Alexandrum Episc. Hierapol. Acacius heard this from John of Antioch.

the great Champion of the Faith. Thence from the security of his own capital, almost with the pride of an independent potentate, but with the unscrupulous use of all means at his command, he directed the movements of the theological warfare, which was maintained for three weary years with the Oriental Prelates. The wealth of Alexandria was his most powerful ally. While yet at Chalcedon, the desponding Orientals complain that their judges are all bought by Egyptian gold.^p But this fact rests on even more conclusive testimony. Maximian, a Roman, had been raised to the vacant see of Constantinople. His first measure betrayed his bearing. He commanded all the churches of Constantinople to be closed against the Oriental Bishops, who desired to pass over from Chalcedon to visit the capital, as being under the unrepealed ban of the Church. A letter has survived, addressed by Cyril's avowed agents to the Bishop of Constantinople. They urge the willing Prelate to endeavour to rouse the somewhat languid zeal of the Princess Pulcheria in the cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity.^q The females of the court were to be solicited with the utmost importunity; the monks, especially the Abbot Dalmatius, and Eutyches (afterwards himself an heresiarch), were to overawe the feeble Emperor by all the terrors of religion, and by no means neglect to impress the Lords of the Bedchamber with the same sentiments. They were to be lavish of

^p This is asserted in the letter of p. 746.

Theodoret of Cyrus: "Nihil enim hunc boni sperandum, eo quod iudices omnes auro confidunt." . . . "Sic enim poterit Ægyptius omnes excicare muneribus suis."—Epist. Legat. ^q Eunapius, the heathen, gives a frightful picture of the venality of the court of Pulcheria. See the new fragment in Niebuhr's Byzantine historians, p. 97.

money; already enormous sums had been sent from Egypt; 1500 pounds of gold had been borrowed of Count Ammonius; and the wealth of the Church of Constantinople was to be as prodigally devoted to the cause. Ministers were to be degraded, more obsequious ones raised to their posts by the influence of Pulcheria, in order to strengthen the pure doctrine, "the pure doctrine of Christ Jesus!"^r

Theodosius, weary of the strife, dissolved the meeting at Chalcedon, and thus the Council of Ephesus, which had assumed the dignity of the third Ecumenical Council, was at an end. All, however, was still unreconciled hatred and confusion. The Oriental Bishops, as they returned home, found the churches at Ancyra and other cities of Asia Minor closed against them, as being under an interdict. They met together, on the other hand, at Tarsus, and afterwards at Antioch; condemned the twelve articles of Cyril, confirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, and included under their ban the seven Bishops, their antagonists at Chalcedon. Maximian ventured on the bold step of deposing four Nestorian Bishops. The strife was hardly allayed by the vast mass of letters^s which distracted and perplexed the world; there was scarcely a distinguished Prelate who did not mingle in the fray. Theodosius himself interfered at length in

Synod of
Chalcedon
dissolved,
A.D. 431.

Synod of
Tarsus,
A.D. 422.

^r The letter in the Synodicon. The Latin is very bad; in some parts unintelligible. A few sentences must be given:—"Et Dominum meum sanctissimum abbatem roga ut Imperatorem mandet, terribili cum conjunctione constringens, et ut cubicularios omnes ita constringat. . . . Sed de tuâ Ecclesiâ præsta avaritiæ quorum nosti, ne Alexandrinorum Ecclesiam contristent. . . . Festinet autem Sanctitas tua rogare Dominam Pulcheriam, ut faciat Dominum Lausum intrare et Præpositum fieri, ut Chrysoretis potentia dissolvatur, et sic dogma nostrum roboretur. Alioquin semper tribulandi sumus."

^s They occupy page after page of the great Collection of the Councils.

the office of conciliation. Misdoubting, however, the extent of the Imperial authority, which had so manifestly failed in controlling this contest into peace, he cultivated the more potent intercession of the famous Simeon Stylites: the prayers of the holy "Martyr in the air" might effect that which the Emperor had in vain sought by his despotic edicts. John of Antioch and his party deputed Paul, the aged Bishop of Emesa, to Alexandria, to negotiate a reconciliation. Paul bore with him a formulary agreed upon at Antioch, the subscription to which by Cyril was the indispensable preliminary of peace. On the acceptance of this formulary, and the consent of Cyril to anathematise all who should assert that the Godhead had suffered, or that there was one nature of the Godhead and the Manhood, he and the Orientals would revoke the sentence of excommunication against Cyril.^t

But Paul of Emesa, amiably eager for peace, and not
Treaty of
peace. insensible to the dignity of appearing as arbiter
between these two great factions, was no match
for the subtlety of Cyril. Cyril was ill at the time of Paul's arrival, and some time elapsed in fruitless negotiation. At length, after an ambiguous assent to the formulary of Antioch by Cyril, a treaty was concluded, in which Paul unquestionably exceeded his powers. But no sooner were the terms agreed upon than the doors of the Alexandrian churches flew open, and the contending parties vied with each other in flattering homilies.^u At first the Orientals were startled at what appeared the unwarrantable concessions of Paul: "it was a peace," in the language of one, "which filled us

^t Ibas. Epist. ad Maron. in Synodico.

^u See the three homilies of Paul, and one of Cyril.

with confusion of face and apprehension of the just judgment of God." * The more violent of Cyril's friends were equally displeased with the event. Isidore of Pelusium openly reproached him with his time-serving concessions and with the recantation of his own doctrines. †

After some further contest, the peace negotiated in Alexandria was ratified at Antioch. The Orientals yielded their assent to the deposition of Nestorius, the condemnation of his doctrines, and acknowledged the legitimate nomination of his successor Maximianus in the see of Constantinople. On the other hand Cyril, though spared the public disavowal of his own tenets, had purchased, in the opinion of many, his restoration to communion with the Orientals by a dishonourable compromise of his bolder opinions.

It was a peace between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria, not between the contending factions, which became more and more estranged and separated from each other. But the peace between John and Cyril soon grew into a close alliance, and John began to persecute his old associates. The

* Epist. Theodoret. Cyren. ad finem.

† Isidor. Pelus. Epist. ad Cyrill. Facundus de Trib. Capit. xi. 9. Isidore of Pelusium was no friend of Cyril. From the first he saw through his character. During the Council of Ephesus he solemnly admonished his bishop in terms like these: "Strong favour is not keensighted, hate is utterly blind: keep thyself unsullied by both these faults: pass no hasty judgments: try every cause with strict justice. . . . Many of those summoned

to Ephesus mock at thee (σε κωμωδοῦσι) as one who seeks only to glut his private revenge, and has no real zeal for the orthodoxy which is in Christ Jesus. He, they say, is the sister's son of Theophilus, and follows the example of his uncle. As he manifestly gave free scope to his animosity against the God-inspired and God-beloved Chrysostom, so does this man against Nestorius," &c. &c. — Isid. Pelus. Epist. i. 310. See also the Letters to the Emperor Theodosius, 311, and to Cyril, 323, 324, 370.

first victim was Nestorius himself, now sunk to so low a state of insignificance as to expose him to the suspicion and hatred of his enemies, without retaining the attachment of his former friends. His obscure fate contrasts strongly with the vitality of his doctrines. By an Imperial edict, obtained not improbably by John of Antioch, who was weary of a troublesome neighbour, Nestorius in his old age was exiled to the Egyptian Oasis, as the place most completely cut off from mankind, so that the contagion of his heresy might be confined to the narrowest limits. Even there he did not find repose. The Oasis was overrun by a tribe of barbarous Africans, the Blemmyes. These savages, out of respect or compassion, released their aged captive, who found himself in Panopolis: and, having signified his arrival and his adventures to the Prefect of the city, expressed his hope that the Roman Government would not refuse him that compassion which he had found among the savage heathen. The heretic reckoned too much on human sympathies. He was hastily despatched under a guard of soldiers to Elephantine, the very border of the Roman territory, and recalled as hastily. These journeys wore out his old and infirm body: and, after a vain appeal to the court to be spared a fourth exile, which is mocked by the ecclesiastical historian as a new proof of his obstinacy, he sunk into the grave. But there the charity of the historian Evagrius does not leave him in peace: he relates with undisguised satisfaction a report that his tongue was eaten with worms; and from these temporal pains he passed to the eternal and unmitigable pains of hell.²

The three great Sees were now in possession of the

anti-Nestorians. Cyril ruled in Alexandria; Maximian had been succeeded in Constantinople by Proclus, the ancient and inveterate antagonist of Nestorius; and John in Antioch. But, besides the Nestorians, there was a strong anti-Cyrellian party among the Orientals, the former allies of John of Antioch, who protested against the terms of the peace. They maintained the uncanonical deposition of Nestorius, though they disclaimed his theology; they asserted the unrepealed excommunication of Cyril. Alexander, Bishop of Hierapolis, declared that he would suffer death or exile rather than submit to Church communion with the Egyptians on such terms; and declared that John must be lost to all sense of shame. On this principle the leading Bishops of nine provinces revolted against their Patriarchs,—the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Mœsia, Thessalia, Isauria, the second Cappadocia. They even ventured to send a protest to Sixtus, who had now succeeded Celestine in the See of Rome, in which they inveighed against the versatility and perfidy of John of Antioch. But an edict, obtained by the two dominant influences in the Byzantine court, that of gold^a and that of the Princess Pulcheria, armed John with powers to expel the refractory Prelates from their sees; and John had no scruples in punishing that mutinous spirit which he had encouraged so long. Nor were these Bishops prepared to suffer the martyrdom of degradation. Andrew of Samosata, Theodoret of Cyrus. Helladius of Tarsus, the leaders of that party, submitted to the hard necessity. It is probable, however, that the

^a “Audivimus olim quod multum satagerit Verius, qui pro Joanne Constantinopoli latitat, et *aurum multum* distribuerit aliquibus ut posse obtinere sacram, quæ nos cogeret aut communicare Joanni, aut exire ab ecclesiis: quod etiam veraciter contigit.” — Meletii Epist. ad Maximian. Anagarb.

milder terms enforced upon them only required communion with John; they were not compelled to give their formal assent to the deposition of Nestorius, or to withdraw their protest against the twelve articles of Cyril, or to repeal the anathema against him. Some, however, were more firm; Meletius of Mopsuestia was forcibly expelled from his city by a rude soldiery, and fourteen other Bishops bore degradation rather than submit to these galling concessions.

At the same time that Nestorius was banished from Antioch, an Imperial edict proscribed Nestorianism.^b The followers of Nestorius were to be branded by the odious name of Simonians, as apostates from God; his books were prohibited, and, when found, were to be publicly burned; whoever held a conventicle of the sect was condemned to confiscation of goods. But however oppressed in the Roman Empire, Nestorianism was too deeply rooted in the Syrian mind to be extinguished either by Imperial or by ecclesiastical persecution. It took refuge beyond the frontiers, among the Christians of Persia. It even overleaped the stern boundary of Magianism, and carried the Gospel into parts of the East as yet unpenetrated by Christian missions. The farther it travelled eastwards the more intelligible and more congenial to the general sentiment became its Eastern element, the absolute impassibility of the Godhead. Even in the Roman East it maintained, in many places a secret, in some an open resistance to authority.^c The great Syrian School, that of

^b Codex Theodos. de Hæret. xvi. v. cñ.

^c Gibbon, at the close of his 47th chapter, has drawn one of his full,

rapid, and brilliant descriptions of the Oriental conquests of the Nestorians, from Assemani, Renaudot, La Croze, and all other authorities extant in his

Theodore of Mopsuéstia and Diodorus of Tarsus, the most popular of the Syrian theologians, were found to have held opinions nearly the same with those of Nestorius. Cyril and Proclus demanded the præscription of these dangerous writers; but the Eastern Prelates, those of Edessa, and the successors of Theodore, indignantly refused submission. Another controversy arose, which was not laid to rest, but was rather kept alive by the new heresy which, during the next twenty years, confused the Eastern Churches and demanded a fourth General Council—Eutychianism.

Sixtus III., the successor of Celestine, had ruled in Rome during these later transactions in the East; he was to be succeeded by one of greater name.

A.D. 432-440
July 31;
Aug. 18.

day. Nestorianism and its kindred or rival sects retired far beyond the sphere of Latin Christianity; it was not till the Portuguese conquests in the East that they came into contact and collision. The very recent works of Layard and the Rev. Mr. Badger reveal to us the present state of the settlements of the Nestorians—the latter, then creed and discipline—in the neighbourhood of the Tigris and Euphrates.

CHAPTER IV.

Leo the Great.

THE Pontificate of Leo the Great is one of the epochs in the history of Latin, or rather of universal Christianity. Christendom, wherever mindful of its divine origin, and of its proper humanising and hallowing influence, might turn away in shame from these melancholy and disgraceful contests in the East. On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and, if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such conscious power as by such singular and unimpeachable virtue; and by such inestimable benefits conferred on Rome, on the Empire, on civilisation. Once Leo was supposed to have saved Rome from the most terrible of barbarian conquerors; a second time he mitigated the horrors of her fall before the king of the Vandals. During his pontificate, Leo is the only great name in the Empire; it might almost seem in the Christian world. The Imperial Sovereignty might be said to have expired with Theodosius the Great. Women ruled in Ravenna and in Constantinople, and their more masculine abilities, even their virtues, reflected a deeper shame on the names of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., the boy Sovereigns of the East and West. Even after the death of Theodosius, Marcian reigned in the East, as the

Leo the
Great
A.D. 440.
Aug.

husband of Pulcheria. In the West the suspected fidelity impaired the power, as it lowered the character of Aëtius; his inhuman murder deprived the Empire of its last support; and the Count Boniface, A.D. 430.
Nov. 28. the friend of Augustine, in his fatal revenge, opened Africa to the desolating Vandal. Leo stood equally alone and superior in the Christian world. Two years before the accession of Leo, Augustine had died. He had not lived to witness the capture and ruin of Hippo, his episcopal city. The fifth year after A.D. 445. the accession of Leo, died Cyril of Alexandria; Nestorius survived, but in exile, his relentless rival. Cyril was succeeded by Dioscorus, who seemed to have inherited all which was odious in Cyril, with far inferior polemic ability; afterwards an Eutychian heretic, and hardly to be acquitted of the murder of his rival, Flavianus. This future victim of the enmity of Dioscorus, filled the see of Constantinople. Domnus, a name of no great distinction, was Patriarch of Antioch. In the West there are few, either ecclesiastics or others, who even aspire to a doubtful fame, such as Prosper, the poet of the Pelagian controversy, and Cassianus, the legislator of the Western monasteries.

Leo, like most of his great predecessors and successors, was a Roman. He was early devoted to the service of the Church; and so high was the opinion of his abilities, that even as an acolyte he was sent to Africa with letters condemnatory of Pelagianism. By the great African Prelates, Aurelius and St. Augustine, he was confirmed in his strong aversion to those doctrines which might seem irreconcilable with his ardent piety. He urged upon Pope Sixtus the persecution of

the unfortunate Julianus.* When Leo was yet only a Deacon, Cassianus dedicated to him his work on the Incarnation. At the decease of Pope Sixtus, Election of Leo. Leo was absent on a civil mission, the importance of which shows the lofty estimate of his powers. It was no less than an attempt to reconcile the two rival generals, Aëtius and Albinus, whose fatal quarrel hazarded the dominion of Rome in Gaul. There was no delay; all Rome, clergy, senate, people, by acclamation, raised the absent Leo to the vacant see. Leo disdained the customary hypocrisy of compelling the electors to force the dignity upon him. With the self-confidence of a commanding mind he assumed the office,^b in the pious assurance that God would give him strength to fulfil the arduous duties so imposed. Leo was a Roman in sentiment as in birth. All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone.^c The union

* "His insidit Sixtus papa, diaconi Leonis hortatu, vigilanter occurrens, nullum aditum pestiferis conatibus patere permisit, et . . . omnes catholici de rejectione fallacis bestię gaudere fecit."—Prosper, in Chronic.

^b "Etsi necessarium est trepidare de merito, religiosum est gaudere de dono . . . ne sub magnitudine gratiæ succumbat infirmus, dabit virtutem, qui contulit dignitatem."—Sermo xi.

^c Nothing can be stronger than the declarations of the Popes that even

they are strictly subordinate to the law of the church. "Contra statuta patrum concedere aliquid vel mutare nec hujus quidem sedis potest auctoritas." Zos. Epist. sub ann. 417. "Sumus subiecti canonibus, qui canonum præcepta servamus."—Cœlest. ad Episc. Illyr. "Privilegia sanctorum patrum canonibus instituta et Nicæ synodi fixa decretis nulla possunt improbitate convelli, nulla novitate violari."—S. Leo. Epist. 78: compare Epist. 80. "Quoniam contra statuta paternorum

of the Churchman and the Roman is singularly displayed in his sermon on the day of St. Peter and St. Paul; their conjoint authority was that double title to obedience on which he built his claim to power, but chiefly as successor of St. Peter, for whom and for his ecclesiastical heirs he asserted a proto-Apostolic dignity. From Peter and through Peter all the other Apostles derived their power. No less did he assert the predestined perpetuity of Rome, who had only obtained her temporal autocracy to prepare the way, and as a guarantee, for her greater spiritual supremacy. St. Peter and St. Paul were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome. Pagan Rome had been the head of the heathen world; the empire of her divine religion was to transcend that of her worldly dominion. Her victories had subdued the earth and the sea, but she was to rule still more widely than she had by her wars,^d through the peaceful triumphs of her faith.^d It was because Rome was the capital of the world that the chief of the Apostles was chosen to be her teacher, in order that from the head of the world the light of truth might be revealed over all the earth.

The haughtiness of the Roman might seem to predominate over the meekness of the Christian. Leo is indignant that slaves were promoted to the dignity of the sacerdotal office; not merely did he require the consent of the master, lest the Church should become a refuge for contumacious slaves, and the established

canonum nihil cuiquam audire conceditur, ita si quis diversum aliquid discernere velit, se potius minuet, quam illa corrumpat; quæ si (ut oportet) a sanctis Pontificibus observantur per universas ecclesias, tranquilla erit pax

et firma concordia."—Epist. 79.

^d "Per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsidere religione divinâ quam dominatione terrenâ."—Serm. lxxxiii.

rights of property be invaded, but the baseness of the slave brought discredit on the majesty of the priestly office.*

Though Leo's magnificent vision of the universal dominion of Rome and of Christianity blended the indomitable ambition of the ancient Roman with the faith of the Christian, the world might seem rather darkening towards the ruin of both. Leo may be imagined as taking a calm and comprehensive survey of the arduous work in which he was engaged, the state of the various provinces over which he actually exercised, or aspired to supremacy. In Rome heathenism appears, as a religion, extinct; but heretics, especially the most odious of all, the Manicheans, were in great numbers. In Rome, Leo ruled not merely with Apostolic authority, but took upon himself the whole Apostolic function. He was the first of the Roman Pontiffs whose popular sermons have come down to posterity. The Bishops of Constantinople seem to have been the great preachers of their city. Pulpit oratory was their recommendation to the see, and the great instrument of their power.†

* "Tanquam servilis vilitas hunc honorem capiat. . . . Duplex itaque in hac parte reatus est, quod et *sacrum ministerium talis consortii vilitate polluitur*, et dominorum . . . jura solvuntur."—Epist. iv.

† Sozomen asserts that it was a peculiar usage of the Church of Rome that neither the bishop nor any one else preached in the church: οὐτε δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὐτε ἄλλος τις ἐνθάδε ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας διδάσκει. H. E. vii. 19. This statement, defended by Valesius, is vehemently impugned by many Roman Catholic writers. Quesnel confines it to sermons on particular occasions. But the assertion of Sozo-

men is clearly general, and contrasted with the usage of Alexandria, where the bishop was the only preacher. If this be true, the usage must have been subsequent to the beginning of Arianism, perhaps grew out of it. The presumption of ignorance or error in Sozomen arises out of the generality of his statement, that there was in fact no preaching in Rome. The style of Leo's sermons, brief, simple, expository, is almost conclusive against any long cultivation of pulpit-oratory. They are evidently the first efforts of Christian rhetoric—the earliest, if vigorous, sketches of a young art. Compare page 35.

Chrysostom was not the first, though the greatest, who had been summoned to that high dignity, for the fame of his eloquence. From the pulpit Nestorius had waged war against his adversaries. Leo, no doubt, felt his strength; he could cope with the ruins of the people, and made the pulpit what the rostrum had been of old. His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe; without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion: it is the Roman Censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman Prætor dictating the law, and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian—Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with especial emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ.⁸ Either the practical mind of Leo disdained, or in Rome the age had not yet fully expanded the legendary and poetic religion, the worship

⁸ One class were what may be described as charity-sermons. At a certain period of the year collections were made for the poor throughout all the regions of Rome. This usage had been appointed to supersede some ancient superstition, it is supposed the Ludi Apollinares, held on the 6th of July. The alms of the devout were to surpass in munificence the offerings of the heathen. These collections seem to have replaced in some degree the sportula of the wealthy, and the ostentatious largesses of the Emperors. On almsgiving Leo insists with great energy. It is an atonement for sin.—

Serm. vii. In another place, "elemosynæ peccata delent." Fasting, without alms, is an affliction of the flesh, no sanctification of the soul. There is a beautiful precept urging the people to seek out the more modest of the indigent, who would not beg: "Sunt enim qui palam poscere ea, quibus indigent, erubescunt; et malunt miserâ tactæ egestatis affligi, quam publicâ petitione confundi . . . pauperum eorum consultum fuerit et pudori."—Serm. ix. p. 32-3. Leo denounces usury—"fœnus pecuniæ funus animæ."—Serm. xvii.

of the Virgin and the Saints. St. Peter is not so much a sacred object of worship as the great ancestor from whom the Roman Pontiff has inherited supreme power. One martyr alone is commemorated, and that with nothing mythic or miraculous in the narrative—the Roman Laurentius, by whose death Rome is glorified, as Jerusalem by that of Stephen.^h

Leo condemns the whole race of heretics, from Arius down to Eutyches; but the more immediate, more dangerous, more hateful adversaries of the Roman faith were the Manicheans. That sect, in vain proscribed, persecuted, deprived of the privilege of citizens, placed
The Mani-
chees out of the pale of the law by successive Imperial edicts; under the abhorrence not merely of the orthodox, but of almost all other Christians; were constantly springing up in all quarters of Christendom with a singularly obstinate vitality. At this time they unquestionably formed a considerable sect in Rome and in other cities of Italy. Manicheism, according to Leo, summed up in itself all which was profane in Paganism, blind in carnal Judaism, unlawful in magic, sacrilegious and blasphemous in all other heresies.ⁱ It does not appear how far the Manicheism of the West had retained the wilder and more creative system of its Oriental founder; or, subdued to the more practical spirit of the West, adhered only to the broader anti-Materialistic and Dualistic tenets. But these more general principles were obnoxious in the highest degree to the whole Christianity of the age. Where the great rivalry of the contending parties in Christendom was to assert most peremptorily, and to define most distinctly, the Godhead and the humanity of the Redeemer, nothing

^h Serm. lxxv.

ⁱ Serm. xvi.

could be more universally abhorrent than a creed that made the human person of the Redeemer altogether unreal, and was at least vague and obscure as to his divinity; which in that Redeemer was clearly extraneous and subordinate to the great Primal Immaterial Unity. All parties would unite in rejecting these total aliens from the Christian faith.^k But Leo had stronger reasons for his indignation against the Roman Manicheans. Whether the asceticism of the sect in general had recoiled into a kind of orgiastic libertinism, or whether the polluting atmosphere of Rome, in which no doubt much of pagan licentiousness must have remained, and which would shroud itself in Christian, as of old in pagan mysteries, the evidence of revolting immoralities is more strong and conclusive against these Roman Manicheans than against any other branch of this condemned race at other times. The public, it might seem the ceremonial violation of a maiden of tender years, in one of their religious meetings, was witnessed, it was said, by the confession of the perpetrator of the crime; by that of the elect who were present; by the Bishop, who sanctioned the abominable wickedness.^l The investigation took place before a great assembly of the principal of the Roman priesthood, of the great civil officers, of the Senate, and of the people. Oct. 10, 443.

We cannot wonder that the penalties fell indiscriminately upon the whole sect. Some, indeed, were admitted to penance, on their forswearing Manes and all his impious doctrines, by the lenity of Leo; others were driven into exile; still, however, no capital punishment

^k S. Leo, Serm. xvi. and xlii.

^l Epist. ad Turib. xiv. Epist. viii. Rescript. Valentin. "Coram Senatu

amplissimo manifestâ ipsorum confessione patefacta sunt."

was inflicted. Leo wrote to the Bishops of Italy, exhorting them to search out these pestilent enemies of Christian faith and virtue, and to secure their own flocks from the secret contamination. Jan. 444. The Emperor Valentinian III., no doubt by the advice of Leo, issued an edict confirmatory of those laws of his predecessors by which the Manicheans were to be banished from the whole world. They were to be liable to all the penalties of sacrilege. It was a public offence. The accusers were not to be liable to the charge of delation. It was a crime to conceal or harbour them. All Manicheans were to be expelled from the army, and not permitted to inhabit cities; they could neither make testaments nor receive bequests. The cause of the severity of the law was their flagrant and disgraceful immorality.

If Italy did not fully acknowledge, it did not contest the assumed supremacy of the Roman See. Leo writes not only to the Bishops of Tuscany and Campania, but to those of Aquileia and of Sicily, as under his immediate jurisdiction.

Africa was among the provinces of the Western Empire. It was a part of the Latin world—an indispensable part—as being now, since the Egyptian supplies were alienated to the East, with Sicily, the sole granary of Rome and of Italy. Africa. If the patriarchate of Rome was co-extensive with the Western Empire, Africa belonged to her jurisdiction, and the closest connexion still subsisted between these parts of Latin Christendom. Latin had from the first been the language of African theology; and of the five or six greatest names among the earlier Western fathers, three, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, were of those provinces. In every struggle and in every controversy

Africa had taken a leading part. She had furnished her martyrs in the days of persecution; she had contended against all the heresies of the East, and repudiated the subtle metaphysics of Greek Christendom; orthodoxy had in general triumphed in her deliberations. By the voice of St. Augustine she had discomfited Manicheism; and it was her burning temperament which, in the same great writer, had repelled the colder and more analytic Pelagianism, and made the direct, immediate, irresistible action of divine grace upon the soul an established article of the Western creed. Her councils had been frequent, and commanded general respect; her bishops were incredibly numerous in the inland districts; and, on the whole, Christianity might seem more completely the religion of the people than in any other part of the empire.

But the fatal schism of the Donatists had, for more than a century, been constantly preying upon her strength, and induced her to look for foreign interference. The orthodox church had, in her distress, constantly invoked the civil power. The Emperor naturally looked for advice to the bishops around him, especially to the Bishop of Rome; and from the earliest period, when Constantine had referred this controversy to a council of Italian prelates, they had been thus indirectly the arbiters in the irreconcilable contest. For even down to the days of St. Augustine, and beyond the Vandal conquest of Africa, the Donatists maintained the strife, raised altar against altar, compared the number of their bishops with advantage to those of their adversaries, resisted alike the reasonings of the orthodox, and the more cogent arguments of the imperial soldiery. The more desperate, the more fierce and obstinate the fanaticism. The ravages of the Circumcellions were

perpetually breaking out in some quarter; the civilisation which had covered the land, up to the borders of the desert, with peaceful towns and villages, so much promoted by the increased cultivation of corn, and which at once contributed to extend Christianity and was itself advanced by Christianity, began to suffer that sad reverse which was almost consummated by the Vandal invasion. The wild Moorish tribes seemed training again towards their old unsubdued ferocity, and preparing, as it were, to sink back, after two or three more centuries, into the more congenial state of marauding Mahometan savages.

But Africa, notwithstanding the difficulties which arose out of these sanguinary contentions, and the constant demands of assistance from the civil power in Italy, conscious of her own intellectual strength, and proud of the unimpeached orthodoxy of her ruling churches, by no means surrendered her independence. If Rome at times was courted with promising submissiveness, at others it was opposed with inflexible obduracy. Though Cyprian, by assigning a kind of primacy to St. Peter, and acknowledging the hereditary descent of the Roman Bishop from the great apostle, had tended to elevate the power of the Pontiff, yet his great name sanctioned likewise almost a contemptuous resistance to the Roman ecclesiastical authority. The African Councils had usually communicated their decrees, as of full and unquestioned authority, not submitted them for a higher sanction. The inflexibility of the African Bishops had but recently awed the Pelagianising Zosimus back into orthodoxy. Some events, which had brought the African churches into direct collision with the Roman Pontiff, betrayed in one case an admission of his power, on the other a steadfast determination of resistance,

which would disdain to submit to foreign jurisdiction. In the first, Augustine himself might seem to set the example of homage—opposing only earnest and deprecatory arguments to the authority of the Roman Pontiff.^m It was the African usage to erect small towns, even villages, into separate sees. St. Augustine created a bishopric in the insignificant neighbouring town of Fussola. He appointed a promising disciple, ^{Antonius} ^{Bishop of} ^{Fussola.} named Antonius, to the office. But, removed from the grave control of Augustine, the young bishop abandoned himself to youthful indulgences, and even to violence, rapine, and extortion. He was condemned by a local council; but, some of the worst charges being insufficiently proved, he was only sentenced to make restitution, deprived of his episcopal power, but not degraded from the dignity of a bishop. Antonius appealed to Rome; he obtained the support of the aged Primate of Numidia, by the plausible argument that, if he had been guilty of the alleged enormities, he was unworthy of, and ought to have been degraded from, the episcopal rank. Boniface, who was then Pope, commanded the Numidian bishops to restore Antonius to his see, provided the facts, as he stated them, were true. Antonius, as though armed with an absolute decree, demanded instant obedience from the people of Fussola: he threatened them with the Imperial troops, whom, it would seem, he might summon to compel the execution of the Papal decree. The people of Fussola wrote in the most humble language to the new Pope, Celestine, entreating to be relieved from an oppression, as they significantly hinted, more grievous than they had suf-

ferred under the Donatist rule, from which they had but recently passed over into the Catholic Church. They threw the blame on Augustine himself, who had placed over them so unworthy a bishop. Augustine confessed his error, and urged the claims of the people of Fussola for redress in the most earnest terms. He threatened to resign his own see. The dispute ended in the suppression of the see of Fussola, by the decree of a Council of Numidia, and the assent of Celestine. It was reunited to that of Hippo.

But the second dispute was not conducted with the same temper—it terminated in more important consequences.

Apiarius.

Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca, was degraded for many heinous offences by his own bishop. On his appeal, he was taken under the protection of Rome without due caution or inquiry by the hasty Zosimus. Zosimus commanded his restoration to his rank, as well as to the communion of the Church.

A.D. 419.

The African bishops protested against this interference with their episcopal rights. In an assembly of 217 bishops at Carthage, appeared Faustinus, Bishop of Picenum, and two Roman presbyters. They boldly produced two canons of the Council of Nicæa, that first and most sacred legislative assembly, to which Christendom owed the establishment of the sound Trinitarian doctrine, and which was received by all the orthodox world with unbounded reverence. These canons established a general right of appeal from all parts of Christendom to Rome. The Bishop of Rome might not only receive the appeal, but might delegate the judgment on appeal to the neighbouring bishops, or commission one of his own presbyters to demand a second hearing of the cause, or send judges, according to his own discretion, to sit as assessors, representing the

Papal authority with the bishops of the neighbourhood.^a African bishops protested, with exemplary gravity, their respect for all the decrees of the Nicene Council; but they were perplexed, they said, by one circumstance that in no copy of those decrees, which they had ever seen, did such Canons appear. They requested that the authentic copies, supposed to be preserved at Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, might be inspected.^o It turned out, that either from ignorance, in himself almost incredible, or from a bold presumption of ignorance in others, not less inconceivable, the Bishop of Rome had adduced Canons of the Synod of Sardica, a council of which the authority was in many respects highly questionable, and which did not aspire to the dignity of a General Council, for the solemn decrees of the great Ecumenic Senate. The close of this affair was as unfavourable as its conduct to the lofty pretensions of the Roman Bishop. While the Africans calmly persisted in asserting the guilt of Apiarius, the Bishop of Rome, through his legate, obstinately pronounced him to be the victim of injustice. Apiarius himself, seized by a paroxysm of remorse, suddenly and publicly made confession of all the crimes imputed to him—crimes so heinous and offensive, that groans of horror broke forth from the shuddering judges. The Bishop of Rome was left in the humiliating position of having rashly embarked in an iniquitous cause, and set up as the judge of the African bishops on partial, unsatisfactory, and, as it appeared, utterly worthless evidence. The African bishops pursued their advantage, adduced

^a "E late suo Presbyterum" is the expression—probably heard almost for the first time in these canons.

^o "Habentes auctoritatem ejus a quo destinati sunt."—Labbe, Conc. ii. p. 1590.

the genuine Canons of Nicæa, which gave each Provincial Council full authority over its own affairs, and quietly rebuked the Roman prelate for his eagerness in receiving all outcasts from the Churches of Africa, and interfering in their behalf concerning matters of which he must be ignorant. They asserted that God would hardly grant to one that clear and searching judgement which he ~~denied~~^{denied} to many.^p Thus, in fact, they proclaimed the entire independence of the African Churches on any foreign dominion: they forbade all appeals to transmarine judgements.^q

But Africa had not to contest that independence with the ambition and ability of Leo. The long age of peace, wealth, fertility, and comparative happiness which had almost secluded Africa, since the battle of Thapsus, from the wars and civil contentions of the Empire, and had permitted Christianity to spread its beneficent influence over the whole province, was drawing to a close. The Vandal conquest began that long succession of calamities—the Arian persecutions under Hunneric and Thrasimund, the successions of Genseric—the re-conquest by the Eastern Empire, and the internal wars, with their train of miseries, famine, pestilence, devastation, which blasted the rich land into a desert; silenced altogether the clamours of Christian strife still maintained by the irreclaimable Donatists, and quenched all the lights of Christian learning and piety; until, at length, the whole realm was wrested by the strong arm

^p “Nisi forte quispiam est qui credat, unicuique posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam, et innumerabilibus congregatis in unum concilium denegare.”—Labbe, *Concil. ii.* p. 1675.

^q “Quod si ab eis provocandum putaverunt, non provocent ad transmarina judicia, sed ad Primate suarum Provinciarum (aut ad Universale Concilium) sicut et de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est.”—*Ibid.*

of Mohammedanism from its connexion with Christendom and the civilisation of Europe.

The Vandal conquest under Genseric alone belongs to this period. The Vandals, until the invasion of the Huns, had been dreaded as the most ferocious of the Northern or Eastern tribes. Their savage love of war had hardly been mitigated by their submission to Arian Christianity. Yet the invasion of Genseric was at first a conquest rather than a persecution. The churches were not sacred against the general pillage, but it was their wealth which inflamed the cupidity, rather than the oppugnancy of the doctrine within their walls which provoked the insults of the invaders. The clergy did not escape the general massacre: many of them suffered cruel tortures, but they fell in the promiscuous ruin; they were racked, or exposed to other excruciating torments to compel the surrender of their treasures, which they had concealed, or were supposed to have concealed. After the capture of Carthage, bishops and ecclesiastics of rank, as well as nobles, were reduced to servitude. The successor of Cyprian, "*Quod vult Deus*" ("What God wills,"—the African prelates had anticipated our Puritans in their Scriptural names), and many of his clergy were embarked in crazy vessels, and cast on shore on the coast of Naples. Yet Genseric permitted the elevation of another orthodox bishop, Deo Gratias, at the prayer of Valentinian, to the see of Carthage. Valentinian might seem prophetically to prepare succour and comfort for the Romans who should hereafter be carried captives to Carthage.

During the later years of his reign, Genseric became a more cruel persecutor. He would admit only Arian counsellors about his court. The honours of martyrdom

are claimed for many victims, perhaps rather of his jealousy than of his intolerance; for the Vandal dominion was that of an armed aristocracy, few in numbers when compared with the vast population of Roman Africa. He closed the churches of the orthodox in Carthage after the death of Deo Gratias; they were not opened for some time, but at length, at the intervention of the Emperor of the East, they were permitted a short period of peace, until the reign of Genseric's more fiercely intolerant successors, Hunneric and Thrasimund.^{*}

Gaul was the province of the Western empire beyond the limits of Italy (perhaps excepting Africa),
 Gaul. which was most closely connected by civil and ecclesiastical relations with the centre of government. But Northern and Western Gaul, as well as the two Germanies, were already occupied by Teutonic conquerors, Goths, Burgundians, and Franks, and were either independent, or rendered but nominal allegiance to the descendants of Theodosius. Britain appeared entirely lost to the Roman empire and to Christianity. Her Christianity had retired to her remote mountain fastnesses in Wales, Cornwall, Cumberland, and to the more distant islands; it was cut off altogether from the Roman world. But in Gaul the clergy, at least the orthodox clergy, were as yet everywhere of pure Roman, or Gallo-Roman race: the Teutonic conquerors, who were Christians, Goths, Burgundians, Vandals, had not shaken off the Arianism into which they had been converted; and the Franks were still fierce and obstinate pagans. The Southern Province alone retained its full subordination to the Court of Ravenna; and the

^{*} Victor Vitensis, lib. i., with the notes of Ruinart, Hist. Persecutionis Vandalicæ

jealousies and contests among the Bishops of Gaul had already driven them to Rome, the aggrieved for redress against the oppression, the turbulent for protection against the legitimate authority of their Bishops or Metropolitans, the Prelates whose power was contested, for confirmation of their dominion. The acknowledged want of such a superior jurisdiction would thus have created, even if there had been no pretensions grounded on the succession to St. Peter, a jurisdiction of appeal. Nowhere indeed can the origin of appeals be traced more clearly, as arising out of the state of the Church. The Metropolitan power over Narbonese Gaul was contested by the Churches of Arles and Vienne. The circumstances of the times, the retirement of the Prefect of Gaul from Treves to Arles, the dignity which that city had assumed as the seat, however of an usurped, empire, had given a supremacy to Arles. But neither would the metropolitan nor the episcopal dignity be administered with such calm justice as to command universal obedience. Severe discipline and strict adherence to the canons by the austere would excite rebellion, laxity and weakness encourage licence. A remote tribunal would be sought by all, by some out of despair of finding justice nearer home, by some in the hope that a bad cause might find favourable hearing where the judges must be comparatively ignorant, and might be propitiated by that welcome deference which submitted to their authority. Yet, though there are several instances of Bishops deposed, not seldom unjustly, by synods of Gallic Bishops, none had carried his complaint before the Bishop of Rome until towards the end of the fourth century,* Priscillian appealed

from the Council of Bordeaux, not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Emperor. During the Pontificate of Zosimus, Patroclus, Archbishop of Arles, was involved in an implacable feud with Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles.[†] That degradation of Proculus which

A.D. 385.

he could not inflict by his own power, the Metropolitan of Arles endeavoured to obtain by that of Zosimus.[‡] Zosimus, it appears to be admitted, was

deceived by the misrepresentations of Patroclus, and scrupled not to issue the sentence of degradation against the Bishop of Marseilles.[¶] Proculus

Feb. 9, 422.

defied the sentence, and continued to exercise his episcopal powers. The more prudent Pope, Boniface, in a case of appeal from the clergy of Valence against their Bishop, referred the affair back to the Bishops of the province.[×]

Under Leo, the supremacy of the Roman See over Gaul was brought to the issue of direct assertion on his part, of inflexible resistance on that of his opponent. Hilarius, a devout and austere prelate, invested by his admiring biographer in every virtue, in the holiness and charity of a saint, a perfect monk and a consummate prelate—(as a preacher, it was said that Augustine, if he had lived after Hilarius, would have been esteemed his inferior)—was Archbishop of Arles.[✓] His zeal or his

* Every point in this controversy has been discussed with the most unwearied pertinacity by the advocates, —on one side of the high Papal supremacy; on the other, by the defenders of the Gallican liberties. I have endeavoured to hold an equal hand, and to dwell only on the facts which rest on evidence. There is an implacable war between the successive editors of

the works of Leo the Great,—the Frenchman Quesnel, and the Italians, the Ballezins.

† Sulpic. Sever. 11.

‡ Zosim. Epist. 12 ad Patrocl.

¶ Bonifac. Epist. ad Episcop. Galliæ.

✓ The account of his election, by his biographer, is curious. He was designated as bishop by his predecessor Honoratus. He was then a monk of

ambition aspired to raise that metropolitan seat into a kind of Pontificate of Gaul. He was accustomed to make visitations, accompanied by the holy Germanus of Auxerre, not improbably beyond the doubtful or undefined limits of his metropolitan power.* During one of these visitations, charges of disqualification for the episcopal office were exhibited against Celidonius, Bishop, according to some accounts, of Besancon. He was accused of having been the husband of a widow, and in his civil state of having pronounced as magistrate sentences of capital punishment. Hilarius hastily summoned a council of Bishops, and pronounced sentence of deposition against Celidonius. On the intelligence that Celidonius had gone to Rome to appeal against this decree, Hilarius set forth, it is said, on foot, crossed the Alps, and travelled without horse or sumpter-mule to the Great City. He presented himself before Leo, and with respectful earnestness entreated him not to infringe the ancient usages of the Gallic Churches, significantly declaring that he came not to plead before Leo, or as an accuser in a case of appeal, but to protest against the usurpation of

A.D. 445.

Lerins. A large band of the citizens of Ailes, with a troop of soldiers, set out to take him by force. They did not know him: "*spiritualis præda adstat ante oculos inquentium, et nihilominus ignoratur.*" He is discovered, but requires a sign from heaven. A dove settles on his head. —*S. Hilar. Vit. apud Leon. Oper. p. 323.*

* "*Ordinationes sibi omnium per Gallias ecclesiarum vindicans, et debitam metropolitanis sacerdotibus in eam transferens dignitatem; ipsius*

quoque beatissimi Petri reverentiam verbis arrogantibus minuendo . . . ita suæ vos cupiens subdere potestati, ut se Beato apostolo Petro non patiatur esse subjectum." —*Leo. Epist.* This may have been stated by Leo under indignation at the resistance of Hilarius to his authority, and on the testimony of the enemies of Hilarius; but his biographer admits that the very humility of Hilarius had generated a kind of supercilious haughtiness; he was rigid, but to the proud; terrible, but to the worldly. —*p. 326.*

his rights.^a Leo proceeded to annul the sentence of Hilarius and to restore Celidonius to his bishopric. He summoned Hilarius to rebut the evidence adduced by Celidonius, to disprove the justice of his condemnation. So haughty was the language of Hilarius, that no layman would dare to utter, no ecclesiastic would endure to hear such words.^b He inflexibly resisted all the authority of the Pope and of St. Peter; and confronted the Pope with the bold assertion of his own unbounded metropolitan power. Hilarius thought his life in danger; or he feared lest he should be seized and compelled to communicate with the deposed Celidonius. He stole out of Rome, and though it was the depth of winter, found his way back to Arles.^c The accounts of St. Hilarius, hitherto reconcileable, now diverge into strange contradiction. The author of his Life represents him as having made some weak overtures of reconciliation to Leo, as wasting himself out with toils, austerities, and devotions, and dying before he had completed his forty-first year. He died, visited by visions of glory, in ecstatic peace; his splendid funeral was honoured by the tears of the whole city; the very Jews were clamorous in their sorrow for the beneficent Prelate. The people were hardly prevented from tearing his body to pieces, in order to possess such inestimable reliques.^d

^a "Se ad officia non ad causam venisse; protestandi ordine non accusandi quæ sunt acta suggerere."—Vit. Hil.

^b "Quæ nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire."—Ibid.

^c The accounts of this transaction in the Life and in the Letters of Pope

Leo appear to me, considered from the point of view of each writer, strictly coincident, instead of obstinately irreconcilable.

^d The writer describes himself as a witness of this remarkable fact: "Etiam Judæorum concurrunt agmina copiosa. . . . Hebræam concinentium linguam in exequiis honorandis audire

The counter-statement fills up the interval before the death of Hilarius with other important events. Leo addresses a letter to the ^{Hilarius died, A.D. 449.} Bishops of the province of Vienne, denouncing the impious resistance of Hilarius to the authority of St. Peter, and releasing them from all allegiance to the See of Arles. For hardly had the affair of ~~Calidonius~~ been decided by the See of Rome than a new charge of ecclesiastical tyranny had been alleged against Hilarius. The Bishop Projectus complained, that while he was afflicted with illness, Hilarius, to whose province he did not belong, had consecrated another Bishop in his place, and this in such haste, that he had respected none of the canonical forms of election; he had awaited neither the suffrage of the citizens, the testimonials of the more distinguished, nor the election of the Clergy. In this, and in other instances of irregular ordinations, Hilarius had called in the military power, and tumultuously interfered in the affairs of many churches. It is significantly suggested, ~~that~~ on every occasion Hilarius had been prodigal of ~~the~~ most and most awful power possessed by the Church, ~~that~~ of excommunication.* Hilarius was commanded ~~to~~ confine himself to his own diocese, deprived of the authority which he had usurped over the province of Vienne, and forbidden to be present at any future ordinations. But a sentence, in those days more awful than that of the Bishop of Rome, was pronounced against Hilarius. At the avowed instance of Leo, Valentinian promulgated an Imperial Edict, denounced the contumacy of Hilarius against the primacy of the

me recole. Nam nostros ita mœror obsedeat, ut ab officio solito impatiens doloris imbuierit magnitudo."—p. 339.

* "Sed quod munus eum in laicos talem existere, qui solet in sacerdotum damnatione gaudere?"—S. Leon. Epist. ad Vienn.

Apostolic throne, confirmed alike by the merits of St. Peter, the chief of the episcopal order, by the majesty of the Roman city, and by the decree of a holy Council. Peace can alone rule in the Church, if the universal Church acknowledge its Lord. Hilarius is accused of various acts of ecclesiastical tyranny and violence, irregular ordinations, deposals of Bishops without authority: of entering cities at the head of an armed force, of waging war instead of establishing peace. The sentence of so great a Pontiff as the Bishop of Rome did not need Imperial confirmation; but as Hilarius had offended against the Majesty of the Empire, as well as against the Apostolic See, he was reminded that it was only through the mildness of Leo that he retained his see. He and all the Bishops were warned to observe this perpetual Edict, which solemnly enacted that nothing should be done in Gaul, contrary to ancient usage, without the authority of ~~the~~ Bishop of the Eternal City; that the decree of ~~the~~ Apostolic See should henceforth be law; and whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman Pontiff should be compelled to do so by the Moderator of the Provinces.

Spain was already nearly dissevered from the empire of Rome. It had been overrun, it was in great part occupied, by Teutonic conquerors, Suevians, Goths, and Vandals, all of whom, as far as they were Christians, adhered to the Arianism to which they had been converted by their first Apostles. The land groaned under the oppression of foreign rulers, the orthodox Church under the superiority of Arian sovereigns. If the provinces looked back, at least with the

* *Constitutio Valentiniiani*, iii. Augusti. apud S. Leonis Opera, Epist. xi. p. 642.

regret of interrupted habit; to the Imperial government, and in vain hoped for deliverance from the sinking house of Theodosius, the orthodox Church uttered its cry of distress to the Bishop of Rome. It was not, however, against Arianism, but a more formidable and dangerous antagonist; one kindred to that which Leo had suppressed with such difficulty in his own immediate territory.

The blood of the Spanish Bishop Priscillian, the first martyr of heresy, as usual had flowed in vain.^a He had been put to death by the usurper Maximus, at the instigation of two other Spanish prelates, Ithacius and Valens; but to the undisguised horror of such Churchmen as Ambrose and Martin of Tours. Leo more sternly approved this sanguinary intervention of the civil power. But, in justice to Leo, it was the moral and social, rather than civil offence of which he supposed the Priscillians guilty, which justly called forth the vengeance of the temporal Sovereign. In such case alone the spiritual power, which abhorred legal acts of bloodshed, would recur to the civil authority.^b But the opinions of Priscillian still prevailed, and even seemed to have taken deeper root in Spain. Prelates were infected with the indelible contagion. Turibius, the

^a See on Priscillian the remarkable tract of Brandis on Sulpicius Severus. Brandis thinks that Priscillian was condemned for magic, not strictly speaking for heresy, under the law of Valentinian and Valens.

^b "Videbant enim omnem curam honestatis auferri, omnem conjugiorum copulam solvi, simulque divinum jus humanumque subverti, si hujusmodi hominibus usquam vivere cum tali

professione licuisset. Profuit diu ista districtio ecclesiasticæ lenitatis, quæ etsi sacerdotali contenta iudicio, cruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spirituales nonnunquam recurrunt remedia, quæ timent corporale supplicium."—S. Leon. Epist. See Hist. of Christianity, iii. 168.

Bishop of Astorga, laid the burthen of his sorrows before Leo: he asked his advice in what manner to cope with these dangerous adversaries. The doctrines of the Priscillians are summed up in sixteen articles. In these appear the great universal principles of Gnosticism or Manicheism, or rather of Orientalism: the sole existence of the primal Godhead, which preceded the emanation of his virtues. In this primal Godhead, if they recognised a Trinity, it was but a trinity of names. In these articles their enemies detected Arianism and Sabellianism. To the Godhead was opposed the uncreated Power of darkness, equally eternal, sprung from chaos and gloom. The *Christ* existed not till he was born of the Virgin; it was his office to deliver the souls of men, those souls being of the divine Essence, from the bondage of the body, that body created by the spirit of darkness. The Priscillianites fasted rigidly on the day of the Nativity, and on every Sunday, as the day of the Resurrection, no doubt not on account of the unreality of the Saviour's body, but for an opposite reason, because at his birth he was degraded to an union with a material body, and at his resurrection reassumed that infected condition. It was this that set them in perpetual, implacable antagonism, not merely in their secret opinions, but in their public and outward usages, with the rest of the Christian world. Their austere proscription of marriage, and aversion to the procreation of beings with material bodies, led to the accustomed charge, perhaps in many cases, among the rude and ignorant, to the natural consequence, gross licentiousness. The peculiarity of the Priscillian system was an astrological Fatalism. The superstition which prevailed for so long a period in Europe, of assigning certain parts of the human body

A.D. 447.

to the influences of the signs of the Zodiac, assumes its first distinct form in their tenets.¹ It was the earthly part which was subject to these powers, who in some mysterious way were concerned in its creation. Leo proceeded not, by a summary edict, to evoke this question from the Churches of Spain; he recommended the convocation of a general Council of Bishops from the four Provinces of Tarragona, Carthage, Lusitania, and Galicia. If the times prevented this general assembly, the Bishop of Astorga might appeal to a Provincial Council from Galicia alone. Two Councils were held, one at Toledo, the other at Braga in Galicia, in which Priscillianism was condemned in the usual terms of anathema.^k

Illyricum, in the primary division of the Empire, had been assigned to the West; it would be comprehended under the patriarchal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. As early as the pontificate of Siricius, the metropolitan of Thessalonica was appointed as delegate of the Bishop of Rome to rule the province. To this precedent Leo appeals, when he invests Anastasius, Metropolitan of the same city, with equal powers.¹ But he does not rest his title to supremacy on his Patriarchal power, or on the claim of the Western Empire to the allegiance of Illyricum; he grounds it on the

Illyricum.

¹ Cap. xiv. apud Leon. Oper. p. 705. |
 "Ad hanc insaniam pertinet prodigiosa illa totius humani corporis per duodecim cœli signa distinctio, ut diversis partibus diversæ præsideant potestates; et creatura, quam Deus ad imaginem suam fecit, in tantâ sit obligatione siderum, in quantâ est connexionem membrorum."—S. Leon. Epist. xv.

^k It is declared in this decree, that

all who had been twice married, who had married widows, or divorced women, were canonically unfit for the priesthood. Nor was it any excuse that the first wife had been married before baptism. "Cum in baptismo peccata deleantur, non uxorum numerus abrogetur."

¹ Epist. v. ad Episcop. Metrop. per Illyricum constitutos (Jan. 12, 414)

universal dominion which belongs to the successors of St. Peter. The province appears to have acquiesced in his authority, and received with due submission his ordinances concerning the election of Bishops and Metropolitans. But all graver causes were to be referred to Rome for judgement.

The East, again plunged into a new controversy, might look with envy on the passive peace of the West. Supremacy, held by so firm and vigorous a hand as that of Leo, might seem almost necessary to Christendom. The Bishop of Rome, standing aloof, and only mingling in the contests by legates, whom he might disclaim at any time as exceeding their powers, could not but be heard with anxious submission by both parties, and by the Christian world at large. He would be contemplated with awful reverence, as attempting to command troubled Christendom into repose. Nestorianism had been, if not suppressed within the empire, reduced to the utmost weakness; it had been cast forth beyond the limits of the Roman world into distant and miserable exile. Nestorius himself had been the victim of the remorseless persecution.

But the theological balance was too nicely poised on this question, not speedily to descend on the opposite side. Cyril himself, by some of his strong expressions, had given manifest advantage to the Oriental Bishops.^m Many who condemned the heresy of Nestorius, loudly

The Monks. impeached the orthodoxy of the Alexandrian Prelate. Almost throughout the East the monks, mindful perhaps of their Egyptian origin, had been strenuous in the cause of Cyril. In Constantinople they had overawed the government, and powerfully

^m See p. 142.

contributed to the discomfiture of Nestorius. But from character, education, and habits, the Eastern monks were least qualified to be the arbiters in a controversy which depended on fine shades and differences of expression. Their dreamy and recluse life, their rigid ritual observances, even their austerities, instead of sharpening their intellects, led to vague conceptions; and the want of commerce with mankind disabled them from wielding the keen weapons of dialectics, or of comprehending the subtle distinctions taught in the schools of philosophy. From the temperament which drove them to the cell or cloister, and which was not corrected by enlightened education, their opinions quickly became passions; those passions were inflamed by mutual encouragement, emulation, and the corporate spirit of small communities, actuated by a dominant feeling. Nor with them were these, points of abstract and speculative theology: the honour of the Redeemer, the dignity of the Virgin Mother now so rapidly rising into an object of adoration, were deeply committed in the strife. Such men were to speak with precise and guarded language on the unity of the divine and human nature in the person of Christ; on the unity which combined the two in perfect harmony, yet allowed not either to encroach on the separate distinctness, the unalterable and uninterchangeable attributes of the other.

The foremost adherent of Cyril in Constantinople had been Eutyches, a Presbyter, the Archi-
mandrite or Superior of a convent of monks
without the walls of the city.ⁿ At his bidding the

Eutyches

ⁿ Eutyches is three times mentioned as a powerful ally of Cyril in the memorable letter to Maximianus, cited above. Flavian. Epist. ad Leon. Brev. Hist. Eu. 7th c. p. 758. Liberatus in Breviar.

swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil power, terrified the Emperor, and contributed, more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy; he had lived in continence for seventy years; ° nor was it till after his departure from strict orthodoxy that men began to discover his total deficiency in learning.

A new race of Metropolitans had arisen in the more important sees of the East. That of Antioch was filled by Domnus, that of Alexandria by Dioscorus; Flavianus ruled the Church of Constantinople. All these prelates inherited the orthodox aversion to Nestorianism. Dioscorus though he persecuted the relatives of Cyril, despoiled them of their property, and degraded them from their offices, with the violence, the turbulence, and the intolerance of his predecessor, adhered to his anti-Nestorian opinions. A great effort had been made to crush the lingering influence of those Prelates who had resisted Cyril. The aged Theodoret of Cyrus, who had accepted the peace of Antioch, but had not consented either to the condemnation or to the complete absolution of Cyril; Ibas of Edessa, who had defended the suspected writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; Irenæus of Tyre, who, as a civilian, when Count of the Empire, had been held a partisan of the Nestorian party, and though he had been twice married, had been promoted to that see: these, with some others, were degraded from their rank, and sent into exile.

In all these movements, Eutyches and his monks had joined—always their clamours; where tumults in the

° Ad Leon. Epist. sub fin. He complains in another place that Flavianus had not respected his grey hairs.

streets of Constantinople or elsewhere were necessary to advance their cause, succours less becoming their secluded, peaceful, and unworldly character. On a sudden, Eutyches, from the all-honoured and boastful champion of orthodoxy, to his own surprise (for in justice to him he seems to have had no very distinct notions of his own heterodoxy),^p is arraigned, condemned, and finally branded to posterity as the head of a new and odious heresy.

In a Synod held at Constantinople, under the Bishop Flavianus, Eusebius, Bishop of Doryleum, Eutyches accused. solemnly charged Eutyches with denying the two natures in Christ. Thrice was Eutyches summoned before this tribunal, thrice he resisted or eluded the formal citation. He declared himself bound by a vow not to quit his monastery; a vow which, as his adversaries reminded him, he had not very religiously respected during the tumults against Nestorius; he pleaded bad health; he promised to come forward on a future day. At length he condescended to appear, but environed by a rout of turbulent monks, and with an Imperial officer, Florianus, who demanded to take his place in the Synod. The affair now proceeded with more decent gravity. The charge was made by Eusebius, who had practised in the schools as a Master of Rhetoric.^q Eutyches in vain struggled to extricate himself from the grasp of the rigid logician. He took refuge in vague and ambiguous expressions, he equivocated, he contradicted himself; his merciless antagonist pressed him in his dialectic toils, and at length extorted

^p Leo writes of him with sovereign contempt: "Qui ne ipsius quidem symboli initia comprehendit." This old man has not learned what are the first lessons of the Christians. A Flavian. ^q Evagrius.

the heretical confession: the two natures which were distinct before the Incarnation, in the Christ were blended and confounded in one. The Synod heard the confession with horror, amazement, and regret ; Excommunicated. the awful sentence of excommunication was passed; the implacable assertor of orthodoxy against Nestorius found himself cast forth as a convicted and proscribed author of heresy.

But this grave ecclesiastical proceeding has another side. The secret history of the times, preserved by a later but trustworthy authority, if it does not resolve the whole into a wretched court intrigue, connects it too closely with the rise and fall of conflicting female influence, and the power of an Eunuch minister.^r The sage and virtuous Pulcheria had long ruled with undisputed sway the feeble mind of her Imperial brother, Theodosius II. Chrysaphius the Eunuch had risen to the chief administration of public affairs. He was scheming to balance or entirely to overthrow the authority of Pulcheria by the influence of the Empress, the beautiful Eudocia. Chrysaphius was the godson of Eutyches. He had hoped to raise the monk to the see of Constantinople. The elevation of Flavianus crossed these designs. But Chrysaphius did not despair of his end; he still hoped to expel Flavianus from the throne, and replace him by his own spiritual father. Either to estrange the mind of the Emperor from Flavianus, or to gratify his own rapacity, he demanded the customary present to the Emperor on the Prelate's inauguration. Flavianus tendered three loaves of white bread. The minister indignantly rejected this poor offering, and demanded a considerable

^r Theophanes, Chronog. p. 153. Edit. Bonn.

weight of gold. Such offering Flavianus could only furnish by a sacrilegious invasion of the treasures, or profanation of the sacred vessels of the Church. This quarrel was hardly appeased when Chrysaphius endeavoured, with more dangerous friendship, to implicate Flavianus in his own intrigues against Pulcheria. Flavianus not merely eluded the snare, but the Eunuch suspected the Bishop of betraying his secret designs. Eusebius, the antagonist of Eutyches, was of the party of Pulcheria before his advancement to the see of Doryleum; he had held a civil office, probably in the household of the Emperor's sister. He had been an early and an ardent adversary of Nestorius; he now stood forward as the accuser of the no less heretical Eutyches.

But Eutyches was too powerful in the support of his faithful monks, and in the favour of the minister, to submit either to the Bishop of ^{Eutyches} Constantinople, or to a local Synod. He appealed to Christendom—from the Metropolitan of Constantinople to the Metropolitans of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, Alexandria, and Rome. He accused the Bishops at Constantinople of forging or of altering the Acts of their Synod. He demanded a General Council to examine his opinions. The Emperor, under the influence of Chrysaphius, acceded to the request; the Council was summoned to meet at Ephesus, under the presidency of Dioscorus of Alexandria. Letters were despatched to the West by both parties, by Eutyches not only to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Bishop of Ravenna,^a and no

^a The answer of the Bishop of Ravenna is extant in the works of S. Leo, Epist. xxv. The close, in which Chrysologus defers most humbly to Rome, seems to me suspicious.

doubt to others. The support of Leo was too important not to be sought with earnest solicitude. But Eutyches addressed him as a suppliant, imploring his protection against injustice and persecution; Flavianus as an equal, who condescended to inform his brother Bishop of the measures which he had taken against an heretical subject of his diocese, and requested him to communicate the decree of the Constantinopolitan Synod to his brethren in the West. The consentient voice of Leo might restore peace to Christendom. But Leo was too wise to be deluded by the servility of Eutyches, or offended by the stately courtesy of Flavianus.[†] He waited to form his decision with cautious dignity.

At Ephesus met that assembly which has been branded by the odious name of the "Robber Council called "Robber Synod" of Ephesus, Aug. 8, A. D. 449. Synod." But it is difficult to discover in what respect, either in the legality of its convocation, or the number and dignity of the assembled prelates, consists its inferiority to more received and honoured Councils. Two Imperial Commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, attended to maintain order in the Council, and peace in the city. Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, by the Imperial command assumed the presidency.[‡] The bishops who formed the

[†] Quesnel and Pagi on one side, Baronius and the Ballerinis on the other, contest the relative priority of two letters addressed by Flavianus to Leo. The question in debate is whether Flavianus initiated an appeal to Rome. But neither of them contains any recognition of Leo's authority. In the first, according to Ballerini, he sends the account of the proceedings. *ὥστε καὶ τὴν σὴν ὁσιότητα γνῶσαν τὰ*

κατ' αὐτὸν, πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν σὴν θεοσέβειαν τελοῦσι θεοφιλεστάτοις ἐπισκόποις δὴλην ποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ δυσσέβειαν. — p. 757. The second letter, as printed by the Ballerinis, is in the same tone: *δίκαιον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὥς ἡγοῦμαι, διδαχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, ὥς ἐτι κ.τ.λ.*

[‡] Dioscorus wanted the severe and unimpeached austerity of Cyril. He was said to have had a mistress named

Synod of Constantinople were excluded as parties in the transaction, but Flavianus took his place, with the Metropolitans of Antioch and Jerusalem, and no less than three hundred and sixty bishops and ecclesiastics. Three ecclesiastics, Julian, a Bishop, Renatus, a Presbyter, and Hilarius, a Deacon, were to represent the Bishop of Rome.* The Abbot Barsumas (this was an innovation) took his seat in the Council, as a kind of representative of the monks.

Though commenced with seeming regularity, the proceedings of the assembly soon degenerated into disgraceful turbulence, violence and personal conflict. But it is impossible to deny that in this respect the Robber Synod only too faithfully followed, if it exceeded, the legitimate and Œcumenic Council of Ephesus. Its acts were marked with the same indecent precipitation; questions were carried by factious acclamations within, and the Council was overawed by riotous mobs without. But that which was pardonable and even righteous zeal in the cause of Cyril, was sacrilegious tumult in that of Eutyches: the monks who had been welcomed and encouraged as holy champions of the faith when they issued from their cells to affright the Emperor into the condemnation of Nestorius, when they thronged around Eutyches became a mutinous and ignorant rabble.†

The Egyptian faction (for Dioscorus, though tyrannical to the kindred and adherents of Cyril, embraced his opinions with the utmost ardour) looked to this

Irene. He is the subject of the well-known epigram which illustrates Alexandrian wit and boldness—

“Εἰρήνη παντεσσιν,” Ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν
ἐπελθών,
Πῶς δύναται πάντεσσ’, ἦν μόνος ἔνδον
ἔχει;

* They were attended by Dulcitus, a notary. S. Leo. and Synod. Ephes. One, Renatus, had died on the road. Hilarius seems to have taken the lead among Leo’s legates.

† Compare Walch, p. 215.

Council, not so much for the vindication of Eutyches, as for the total suppression of Nestorianism, and, no doubt, the abasement of Flavianus, and in the person of Flavianus, of the aspiring see of Constantinople. But in their blind heat they involved themselves with the creed of Eutyches. The Council commenced with the usual formalities. The proposition to read the letters of Leo to Flavianus, which condemned the doctrine of Eutyches, was refused with the utmost contempt.² Then were rehearsed the acts of the Synod of Constantinople. On the first mention of the two natures in Christ an angry dispute arose. But when the question put to Eutyches by Eusebius of Doryleum was read, whether he acknowledged the two natures after the incarnation, the assembly broke out with one voice, "Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!" The President put the question, "Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?" The sacred Council replied, "Anathema on him who so says!" "I have your voices," said Dioscorus, "I must have your hands! He that cannot cry, let him lift up his hands!" With an unanimous suffrage the whole assembly proclaimed, "Accursed be he who says there are two!" The Council proceeded to absolve Eutyches from all suspicion of heterodoxy, and to reinstate him in all his ecclesiastical honours; to depose Flavianus and Eusebius, and to deprive them of all their dignities. Flavianus alone

Decree of the
Council,
A.D. 449.

* "Quem Alexandrinus antistes, qui totum solus ibi potentiae suae vindicavit, audire contempnit." ἀκούσας ἐκείνους in the Greek.—S. Leon. Epist. 1. ad Constantinop. Leo's letter exists in indifferent Greek, and worse Latin, dated 449, Jan. 13.

pronounced his appeal; Hilarius, the Roman deacon, alone refused his assent.^a The unanimity of the assembly is unquestionable, but it is asserted, and on strong grounds, that it was an unanimity enforced by the dread of the imperial soldiery and the savage monks, who environed and even broke in, and violated the sanctity of the Council.^b Dioscorus pursued his triumph. The deposition of Ibas of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Irenæus of Tyre, and of others who were suspected of Nestorianism, or at least refused to subscribe the anathemas of Cyril, was confirmed. Domnus of Antioch was involved in their fate. Hilarius the deacon fled to Rome; but not so fortunate was Flavianus. After suffering personal insults, it is said even blows, from the furious Dioscorus himself,^c instigated by the monk Barsumas, who shouted aloud, "Strike him, strike him dead!" he expired after a few days, either of his wounds, of exhaustion, or mental suffering. Thus was this the first, but not the last, Christian Council which was defiled with blood.

* Alexandria had succeeded in dictating its doctrine to the whole of Christendom; the Patriarch of Alexandria had triumphed over both his rivals, had deposed the Metropolitan of Antioch, and the more dreaded Bishop of Eastern Rome. Nor was this all. An Imperial edict avouched the orthodoxy and confirmed the acts of the second Council of Ephesus. It involved Flavianus and Eusebius in the charge of Nestorianism; it proscribed Nestorianism in all its forms, branding it by the ill-

^a We hear nothing of the other legate of Leo, the Bishop Julian; the Presbyter Renatus was dead.

^b See the evidence of Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea.

^c Leo, writing from the report of Hilarius, the Deacon, "*Magnum facinus Alexandrino Episcopo auctore vel executore commissum est.*"—*Epiqt. ad Anat.*

omed name of Simonianism: it forbade the consecration of any bishop favourable to Nestorius or *Flavianus*, and deposed them, if unwarily consecrated: it condemned all worship or religious meetings of the Nestorians (and all who were not Eutychians were in danger of being declared Nestorians), under the penalty of confiscation and exile; and interdicted the reading of all Nestorian books, which are ranked with the anti-Christian writings of Porphyry; that is, the works of Nestorius and of Theodoret, and according to one copy of the law, those of Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia also, under the same penalties.

But the law might command, it could not enforce peace. Eastern Christendom was severed into two conflicting parties. Egypt, Palestine, and Thrace, adhered to Dioscorus, while the rest of Asiatic Christendom, Pontus and Asia Minor, still clung to the cause of *Flavianus*.^d Strengthened by the unanimous consent of the West, which entered so reluctantly into these fine metaphysical subtleties, Leo, the Bishop of Rome, refused all recognition of the Ephesian Council. Dioscorus, in the heat of his passion and the pride of success, broke off (an unheard of and unprecedented boldness) all communion with Rome.

A sudden and total revolution at once took place. The change was wrought,—not by the commanding voice of ecclesiastical authority,—not by the argumentative eloquence of any great writer, who by his surpassing abilities awed the world into peace,—not by the reaction of pure Christian charity, drawing together the conflicting parties by evangelic love. It was a new dynasty on the throne of Constantinople.

^d *Liberat. Brev. c. xii.*

The feeble Theodosius dies ; the masculine Pulcheria—the champion and the pride of orthodoxy—the friend of Flavianus and of Leo, ascends the throne, and gives her hand, with a share in the empire, to a brave soldier named Marcianus.

The hopes of one party, and the apprehensions of the other, were realised with the utmost rapidity. The first act of the Government, which Anatolius, the new bishop, who, though nominated by the Egyptian party, was a moderate prudent man, either acquiesced in or promoted, was the quiet removal of Eutyches from the city. This measure was confirmed by a synod at Constantinople.

A more full and authoritative Council could alone repeal the acts of the “Robber Synod” of Ephesus. The only opposition to the summons of such Council at Chalcedon arose from Leo. The Roman Pontiff had urged on the Western Emperor (it is said, on his knees) the necessity for a general Council ; but Leo desired a Council in Italy, where no one could dispute the presidency of the Roman prelate. Prescient, it might seem, of the decree at Chalcedon, which raised the Patriarch of Constantinople to an equality with the Bishop of Rome, he dreaded the convocation of a Council in the precincts and under the immediate influence of the Byzantine court.

At Chalcedon, the Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, met that assembly, which has been admitted to rank as the fourth, by some as the last, of the great Œcumenic Councils. Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, was present, with Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem. Leo appointed as his representatives two bishops and a

Council of
Chalcedon.
Oct. 8,
A.D. 451.

presbyter.^e Above five hundred bishops^f made their appearance. Dioscorus of Alexandria was there, but sat not in the order of his rank, and was not allowed the right of suffrage. Theodoret of Cyrus claimed his seat, but did not obtain it without violent resistance from the Egyptian faction, who denounced him as a Nestorian: his own party retorted charges against the Egyptians, as persecutors of Flavianus, and as Manicheans. The Imperial Commissioners reproved with firmness, and repressed with dignity, but with much difficulty, these rabble-like proceedings.^g

The first act of the Council, after the decrees of the Synod at Ephesus had been read, was to annul the articles of deposition against Flavianus and Eusebius. Many of the bishops expressed their penitence at their concurrence in these acts: some saying that they were compelled by force to subscribe—others to subscribe a blank paper. The Council proceeded to frame a resolution, deposing Dioscorus and five other bishops, as having iniquitously exercised undue influence in the

Oct. 10. Council of Ephesus; but the right of approbation of this decree was reserved to the Emperor. During the whole of this first session, Dioscorus had confronted his adversaries with the utmost intrepidity, readiness, and self-command. He cried aloud, "They are condemning not me alone, but Athanasius and Cyril. They forbid us to assert the two natures

* Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum, Lucentius, Bishop of Esculanum (Ascoli), Boniface, Presbyter of the Church of Rome.

^f This is the number in the Breviarium: Macellinus raises the number to six hundred and thirty. Between

four and five hundred signatures are appended to the acts.

^g It is said in the Breviar. Hist. Eutyech. that the Emperor and Senate were present. The Senate appears in the acts.

after the Incarnation." The night drew on; Dioscorus demanded an adjournment; the Senate refused; the acts were read over by torchlight. The bishops of Illyria proclaimed their abandonment of the cause of Dioscorus. The night was disturbed by wild cries of acclamation to the Emperor and the Senate, appeals to God, anathema to Dioscorus—"Christ has deposed Dioscorus—Christ has deposed the murderer—God has avenged his martyrs!" The Council at the next session proceeded to the definition of the true faith. The Creeds of Nicæa and of Constantinople, the two Epistles of Cyril, and above all the Epistle of Leo to Flavianus, were recognised as containing the orthodox Christian doctrine. The letter of Leo excited acclamations of unbounded joy. "This is the belief of the Fathers,—of the Apostles!" "So believe we all!" "Accursed be he that admits not that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo!" "Leo has taught what is righteous and true; and so taught Cyril!" "Eternal be the memory of Cyril!" "Why was not this read at Ephesus? It was suppressed by Dioscorus!" With this there was again a strange mingled outcry of the Bishops, confessing their sin and imploring forgiveness, and of the adversaries of Dioscorus, chiefly the clergy of Constantinople, clamouring, "Away with the Egyptian, the Egyptian into exile!"

The Imperial Commissioners, who, with some few of the Bishops, were anxious that affairs should proceed with more dignified calmness, hardly restrained the impulse of the Council, who were eager to proceed by acclamation, and at once, to the condemnation of Dioscorus; they accused him of being a Jew. It would, perhaps, have been better for that prelate, if they had been permitted to follow their impulse; for charges now

began to multiply and to darken against the falling Patriarch—charges of disloyalty, of tyranny, of rapacity, of incontinence. Thrice was he summoned to appear (he had not been permitted to resume his seat, or had withdrawn during the stormy course of the proceedings), thrice he disobeyed, or attempted to elude the summons. The solemn sentence was then pronounced by one of the Western Bishops, **the representatives of Leo.** It stated that Dioscorus, **some time Bishop** of Alexandria, had been found guilty of divers ecclesiastical offences. To pass over many, he had admitted Eutyches, a man under excommunication by lawful authority, into communion; he had haughtily repelled all remonstrances; he had refused to read the Epistle of Leo at the Council of Ephesus; he had even aggravated his guilt, by daring to place the Bishop of

Oct. 13.

Rome himself under interdict.^a Leo, therefore, by their voice, and with the authority of the Council, in the name of the Apostle Peter, the Rock and Foundation of the Church, deposes Dioscorus from his episcopal dignity, and excludes him from all Christian rights and privileges. The unanimous Council subscribes the judgement.¹

The decree was temperate and dignified; it contained no unfair or exaggerated accusations; though it might dwell with undue weight on the insulting conduct towards Leo, it condescended to no fierce and abusive

^a Page 424.

¹ It is remarkable that the decree took no notice of the various imputations of heresy against Dioscorus, none of the accusations of murder said to have been perpetrated by him in Alexandria. Compare especially the libel

of Ischyriion the Deacon, who offers to substantiate his charges by witnesses. Either Dioscorus was one of the most wicked of men, or Ischyriion the most audacious of calumniators.—Labbe, p. 398-400.

appellations. Nor was the grave majesty of the assembly disturbed by a desperate rally of the monks, headed by Barsumas. This man, as not unjustly suspected of being implicated in the death of ^{Barsumas} ~~the monk~~ Flavianus, the assembly refused to admit to the honours of a seat. Repelled on all sides, and awed by the Imperial power, the monks appealed to Christ from Cæsar, shook their garments in contempt of the Council, and as a protest against the injustice done to Dioscorus; and then sullenly retired to their solitudes to brood over and propagate in secret their Monophysite doctrines. Some of their traditions assert, in characteristic language, that Barsumas, thus ignominiously expelled by the Council and by the Emperor, pronounced his curse against Pulcheria. She died a few days afterwards, and Barsumas, while he took rank among his followers as a prophet and man of God, became from that time an object of cruel and unrelenting persecution by his enemies.

It is remarkable that the formulary of faith adopted finally by the Council of Chalcedon was brought forward by the Imperial Commissioners. After much altercation and delay, it received at length the sanction of the Council. After this the Civil Government (the Emperor Marcian) issued two laws, addressed to all orders, to the clergy, to the military, and to the commonalty; one prohibited the future agitation of these questions, as tending to tumult: it denounced as the penalty for offences against the statute, degradation to the ecclesiastic, to the soldier ignominious expulsion from the army, to the common man exile from the Imperial city.*

* A strong canon of the Council of the benefices in the East, as in the Chalcedon against simony implies that West, were highly lucrative.

The second decree confirmed all the proceedings at Chalcedon, enforced on the public mind the deferential conclusion, that no private man could hope to arrive at a sounder understanding of these mysteries than had been painfully attained by so many holy bishops, and only after much prayer and profound investigation. The punishment of dissent was left indefinite and at the will of the civil rulers.

But before the final dissolution of the Council at Chalcedon, among thirty canons on ecclesiastical subjects, appeared one of singular importance to Christendom. It asserted the supremacy of the Roman see, not in right of its descent from St. Peter, but solely as the Bishopric of the Imperial City. It assigned, therefore, to the Bishop of the New Rome, as equal in civil dignity, a co-equal and co-ordinate ecclesiastical authority.^m This canon, it is averred, was passed by a few bishops, who lingered behind the rest of the Council; it claims only the subscription of one hundred and fifty prelates, and those chiefly of the diocese of Constantinople. It is not indeed likely that the Alexandrian Church, though depressed by the ignominious degradation of its head, still less that the more ancient Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem should thus tamely acquiesce in the assumption of superiority (unless it were a measure enforced by the Imperial power) by the modern and un-Apostolic Church of Byzantium.ⁿ Leo from this period denounces

^m Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρονῷ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα. — Can. xxviii. p. 769.

ⁿ Leo, in his three epistles on the subject, seems to espouse the cause of

Antioch and Alexandria, as insulted by their degradation from the second and third rank; rivalry with Rome on their part is a pretension of which he will not condescend to entertain a suspicion. "Tanquam cōpōtūnē se tempus hoc tibi obtulerit, quē

the arrogance and presumption of Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople; and this canon of the Ecumenic Council has been refused all validity in the West.

Throughout this long and melancholy ecclesiastical civil war, the Bishop of Rome could not but continue to rise in estimation and reverence, and in their inseparable result, authority. While the East had thus been distracted in every province, the West had enjoyed almost profound religious peace. The circumstances of the time contributed to this state of things; the pre-occupation of the whole Western empire by the terrors of the most formidable invasion which had ever menaced society; the general disinclination to those fine theological distinctions, which rose out of the Grecian schools of philosophy; and, perhaps, the desolation by the savage Vandals of the African Churches, which were most likely to plunge hotly into such disputes, and to drag with them the rest of Latin Christendom. During the whole feud the predecessors of Leo, and Leo himself, had calmly and firmly adhered to those doctrines which were finally received as orthodox. They had acted by common consent as heads and representatives of Western Christendom, and had fully justified the unquestioning confidence of the West by their congeniality with the universal sentiment. Nor had their dignity suffered in the eyes of men by the humiliating scenes to which the great prelates of the East, the Metropolitans of Antioch, of Constantinople, and Alexandria, had been continually exposed; arraignment as

secundi honoris privilegium sedes Alexandrina perdiderit, et Antichena Ecclesia proprietatem tertie dignitatis amisit, ut his locis juri tuo subditis, Metropolitani Episcopi proprio honore

priventur."—Epist. lvi. : ad Anatol. Const. Episc. The Bishop of Rome rebukes the ambition of his brother prelate in the words of St. Paul, "Be not high-minded, but fear !!"

heretics, as criminals, before successive Councils, deposition, expulsion from their sees, excommunication, exile, even death. The feeble interdict issued by Dioscorus against Leo might have been shaken off with silent contempt, if it had not rather suited him to treat it with indignation. Still more the Bishop of Rome had stood uncontaminated, in dignified seclusion from the wretched intrigues and bribery, the venal favour of unpopular ministers, and the trembling dependence on Imperial caprice. Every year became more and more manifest the advantage derived by the Bishop of Rome from the abandonment of Rome as the Imperial residence. The Metropolitan of Constantinople might claim by an ecclesiastical canon, equality with the Roman Pontiff; but the one was growing up into an Independent Potentate, while the other, living under the darkening shadow of Imperial pomp and power, could not but shrink into a helpless instrument of the Imperial will. The fate of the Bishop of Constantinople, his rank and his authority in the Church, even his orthodoxy, depended virtually on the decree of the Emperor. Appearing in all the controversies of the East only in the persons of his delegates, the Bishop of Rome had preserved his majesty uninsulted and unhumbled by the degrading invectives, altercations, even personal contumelies, which had violated the sanctity of the great Eastern prelates. Even if they had not provoked; if they had borne with the most saintly patience the outrages of the popular or monkish rabble at Ephesus or Constantinople, in the general mind the holy character could not but be lowered by these debasing scenes.

Leo seemed fully to comprehend the importance and the dignity of his position. He took the most zealous

interest in the whole controversy, but his activity was grave, earnest, and serious. His language to the Eastern Emperors, and especially to the Princess Pulcheria, may sound too adulatory to modern ears. The divinity of the earthly sovereign was acknowledged in terms too nearly approaching that reserved for the great divine Sovereign. This, however, must be judged with some regard to the sentiments and expressions of the age; and his deference was in language rather than in thought. Leo addresses these earthly masters with an independence of opinion, more as their equal, almost more as their master, than would have been ventured by any other subject at that time in either empire.

In the West, meantime, Leo might seem, under the sole impulse of generous self-devotion and reliance on the majesty of religion, to assume the noblest function of the civil power, the preservation of the Empire, of Italy, of Rome itself, of Christianity, from the most tremendous enemy which had ever threatened their freedom and peace. While the Emperor Valentinian III. took refuge in Rome, and rumours spread abroad of his meditated flight, abdication, abandonment of his throne, Leo almost alone stood fearless. An embassy, of which the Bishop of Rome was no doubt considered by the general reverence of his own age, as well as by posterity, as the head and chief, arrested the terrible Attila on the frontiers of Italy, and dispersed the host of savage and but half-human Huns. Leo, to grateful Rome, might appear as the peaceful Camillus, as the unarmed Marius, repelling invaders far more fearful than the Gauls or the Cimbrians.

The terror of Europe at the invasion of the Huns naturally and justifiably surpassed that of all former barbaric invasions. The Goths and other German tribes

were familiar to the sight of the Romans; some of them had long been settled within the frontier of the empire; they were already for the most part Christian, and, to a certain extent, Romanised in their manners and habits. The Mongol race, with their hideous, misshapen, and, as they are described, scarcely human figures, their wild habits, their strange language, their unknown origin, their numbers, exaggerated no doubt by fear, and swollen by the aggregation of all the savage tribes who were compelled or eagerly crowded to join the predatory warfare, but which seemed absolutely inexhaustible; their almost unresisted career of victory, devastation, and carnage, from the remotest East till they were met by Aëtius on the field of Châlons: at the present time the vast monarchy founded by Attila, which overshadowed the whole Northern frontier of the Empire, and to which the Gothic and other Teutonic kings rendered a compulsory allegiance; their successful inroads on the Eastern Empire, even to the gates of Constantinople; the haughty and contemptuous tone in which they conducted their negotiations, had almost appalled the Roman mind into the apathy of despair. Religion, instead of rousing to a noble resistance against this heathen race, which threatened to overrun the whole of Christendom, by acquiescing in Attila's proud appellation, the Scourge of God, seemed to justify a dastardly prostration before the acknowledged emissary of the divine wrath. The spell, it is true, of Attila's irresistible power had been broken; he had suffered a great defeat, and Gaul was, for a time at least, wrested from his dominion by the valour and generalship of Aëtius. But when, infuriated, as it might seem, more than discouraged by his discomfiture, the yet formidable Hun suddenly descended upon Italy,

the whole peninsula lay defenceless before him. Aëtius, as is most probable, was unable, as his enemies afterwards declared, was traitorously unwilling, to throw himself between the barbarians and Rome. The last struggles of Roman pride, which had rejected the demand of Attila for the hand of the Princess Honoria* (his self-offered bride, whose strange adventures illustrate the degradation of the Imperial family), and which had been delayed by the obstinate resistance of Aquileia to the whole army of Attila, were crushed by the fall and utter extermination of that city, and the total subjugation of Italy as far as the banks of the Po. Valentinian, the Emperor, fled from Ravenna to Rome. To some no doubt he might appear to seek succour at the feet of the Roman Pontiff; but the abandonment of Italy was rumoured to be his last desperate determination.

At this fearful crisis, the insatiable and victorious Hun seemed suddenly and unaccountably to pause in his career of triumph. He stood rebuked and subdued before a peaceful embassy, of which, with the greater part of the world, the Bishop of Rome, as he held the most conspicuous station, so he received almost all the honour. The names of the rich Consular Avienus, of the Prefect of Italy, Trigetius, who ventured with Leo to confront the barbarian conqueror, were speedily forgotten; and Leo stands forth the sole preserver of Italy. On the shores of the Benacus the ambassadors encountered the fearful Attila. Overawed (as the belief was eagerly propagated, and as eagerly accepted) by the personal dignity, the venerable

* Compare Gibbon, c. xxxv. Observe the characteristic words of Jordanes: "Dum ad aula: *decus* virginis tatem suam cogeretur custodiire."

character, and by the religious majesty of Leo, Attila consented to receive the large dowry of the Princess Honoria, and to retire from Italy. The death of Attila in the following year, by the bursting of a blood-vessel, on the night during which he had wedded a new wife, may have been brooding, as it were, in his constitution, and somewhat subdued his fiercer energy of ambition. His army, in all probability, was weakened by its conquests, and by the uncongenial climate and unaccustomed luxuries of Italy. But religious awe may still have been the dominant feeling which enthralled the mind of Attila. The Hun, with the usual superstitiousness of the polytheist, may have trembled before the god of the stranger, whom nevertheless he did not worship. The best historian of the period relates that the fate of Alaric, who had survived so short a time the conquest of Rome, was known to Attila, and seemed to have made a profound impression upon him.^p The

A.D. 452.

dauntless confidence and the venerable aspect of Leo would confirm this apprehension of encountering, as it were, in his sanctuary, the God now adored by the Romans. Legend, indeed, has attributed the submission of Attila to a visible apparition of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who menaced the trembling heathen with a speedy divine judgement if he repelled the proposals of their successor. But this materialising view, though it may have heightened the beauty of Raffaele's painting of Leo's meeting with Attila, by the introduction of præter-human forms, lowers the moral grandeur of the whole transaction. The simple faith in his God, which gave the Roman Pontiff courage to confront Attila, and threw that commanding majesty

^p Priscus, quoted by Jornandes. c. 42.

over his words and actions which wrought upon the mind of the barbarian, is far more Christianly sublime than this unnecessarily imagined miracle.

The incorrigible Romans alone, in their inextinguishable pagan superstition, or their ineradicable pagan passion for the amphitheatre, attributed the deliverance of the city not to the intercession of Leo (like the rest of the world), or to the mercy of God, but to the influence of the stars. They crowded (to his indignation) to the Circensian games, rather than to the tombs of the martyrs.^a Leo might save Rome from the sword of the heathen barbarian, he could not save it from the vices of the Christian sovereign, which were precipitating the Western Empire to its fall, and brought down on Rome a second capture, more destructive than that of the Goth, by the Vandal Genseric. Valentinian III. had taken refuge at Rome; but he found Rome not only more secure, but in its society, its luxury, and its dissoluteness, a more congenial scene for his licence than the confined and secluded Ravenna. He returned to it to indulge more freely in his promiscuous amours. At length the

^a "Pudet dicere, sed oportet non tacere: plus impenditur dæmonis quam apostolis, ~~et~~ majorem obtinent insana spectacula frequentiam, quam beata martyria."—S. Leon. *Serm.* lxxxiv. I am inclined to concur with Baonius (*Annal. sub ann.*) rather than with the later editors of S. Leo's works, Quesnel and the Ballerini, in assigning the short sermon on the Octave of St. Peter to the deliverance from Attila, not to the evacuation of the city by Genseric. Ballerini's view seems impossible. The death of the Emperor Maximus (see below) took place on the 12th of June, three days

after Genseric entered the city; the sack of the city lasted fourteen days, till St. Peter's Day, the 29th; yet Ballerini would suppose that on the octave of that day the Romans were so far recovered from their consternation, danger, and ruin, as to celebrate the Circensian games at great expense, and to attend them in multitudes, which provoked the holy indignation of the bishop. The deliverance, which they ascribed to the stars, rather than to the mercy of God, can hardly have been the abandonment of the plundered and desolate city, with hundreds of the inhabitants carried away into captivity

violation of the wife of a Senator, Petronius Maximus, of the highest rank and great wealth, caused his assassination. In Valentinian closed the Western line of descendants from the great Theodosius. The vengeance of Maximus was not content with the sceptre of the murdered Valentinian; he compelled Eudoxia, the Empress, during the first months of her widowhood, to receive him as her husband; and in the carelessness or the insolence of his triumph, betrayed his own complicity, which was before doubtful, in the assassination of Valentinian. Eudoxia determined on revenge; from her Imperial kindred in the East she could expect no succour; the Vandal fleets covered the Mediterranean; Genseric, not satiated with the conquest of Africa, had already subdued Sicily. At the secret summons of the Empress he landed with a powerful force, at the mouth of the Tiber. The defenceless Romans hastened to sacrifice the cause of their calamities; they joined the followers of Eudoxia in a general insurrection, in which the miserable Maximus perished; his body was hewn in pieces, and then cast into the Tiber.*

But the ambition and the rapacity of Genseric were not appeased by this victim; he advanced towards Rome, where no measures of defence had been taken: none perhaps could have been organised in a city without a ruler, and without a standing force. Leo was again the only safeguard of the city; but the Bishop of Rome was still a man of Christian peace. Unarmed, at the head of his clergy, he issued forth to meet the invader; and though the Arian Vandal, within sight of his prey, and actually master of Rome, still the centre

* Procop. Hist. Vandal. On the character and history of Maximus, read Letter of Sidon. Apollinar. 11, 13.

of riches and luxury—Rome open to his own rapacity and that of his soldiers—was less submissive than the heathen Hun; yet even he consented to some restraint on the cruelty and licence which attend the sack of a captured city. The lives of those who offered no resistance were to be spared; the buildings to be guarded against conflagration, the captives protected from torture. But that was all (and it was much at such a crisis) which the authority of the Pontiff could obtain. The Roman Leo with the rest of his countrymen must witness, what may seem to have aggravated the calamity in the estimation of the world, the late revenge of Carthage, the plunder of Rome by the conquering Africans.* In the pillage, which lasted for fourteen days, if the edifices were spared, the treasures of the churches were forced to surrender all which they had accumulated from the pious munificence of the public during the forty-five years which had elapsed since the sack by Alaric.[†] It has been observed as a singular event that Genseric, a barbarian from the shores of the Baltic, compelled Rome to surrender, and transported to the shores of Africa the spoils of two religions. From the Temple of Peace in Rome he carried off the plunder of the Jewish Holy of Holies, the gold table, and the seven-branched candlestick, which had been deposited as trophies by the Emperor Titus.

* See the spirited lines of Sidonius,—

Heu facinus in bella iterum *quartosque*
labores
Perilda Elissæ *crudescent* classica *Byrsæ*
Nutritis quod lata malum *Conscenderat*
æres
Evandri *Massyla* phalanx, *montesque*
Quilini
Marmarici pressere pedes, *rursusque*, re-
vexit
Quæ captiva dedit quondam stipendia
Barcho. *Sid. Apoll. Panegyric.*—444.

† Leo from the wreck saved three large silver vessels, of 100 pounds each, which he caused to be cast into communion plate for the other destitute churches. Baunius, from this, and other equally insufficient reasons, infers that the three great churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, and the Lateran (?) escaped.

Roman paganism suffered loss no less insulting than that she had inflicted on Jerusalem. The statues of the gods and heroes of ancient Rome had been still permitted to adorn the Capitoline Temple. These, with the roof of gilt bronze, became the prey of the African Vandals, and were consigned as trophies to Carthage. Rome thus ceased altogether to be a pagan city; and Genseric accomplished what, by the dispersion of the old pagan families, had been more than begun by Alaric. The last bond was broken between Christian Rome and the religion of ancient Rome. The ship which bore the gods of Rome to Carthage foundered at sea. The amount of plunder from the Imperial palace and those of the still wealthy nobility, from the temples and the churches, is vaguely stated at many thousand talents. The Vandal avarice stooped to the meaner metals; the copper and the brass were swept away with remorseless rapacity. The Roman aristocracy, which had been scattered to so great an extent by the conquest of Alaric, were now in numbers carried away into captivity: families were broken up, wives separated from husbands, children from parents. Even the Empress Eudoxia and her daughters, the sole survivors of the Western line of Theodosius, were transported as honourable bond-slaves to Carthage; one of the daughters, Eudocia, Genseric married to his son; the mother and the other daughter, who was already married, he released at the request of the Byzantine Emperor Leo, and sent them to Constantinople. But with every successive decimation which thus fell on the Roman nobility, the relative importance of the clergy must have increased, as did that of the Pontiff from the absence of the Emperor from the capital. Rome, after the departure of Genseric's fleet, laden with the spoils and crowded

with captives, selected for their rank, their accomplishments, the females no doubt for their beauty or for their easy submission to the will of the conqueror, was left without government, almost without social organization, except that of the Church. The first Emperor who aspired to the succession of Maximus was Avitus in Gaul.

The calamity which could not be averted by the commanding authority of the Bishop of Rome, was mitigated by the active and judicious charity of the Bishop of Carthage. Deo Gratias, by the manner in which he devoted himself to the service of the wretched captives dragged away from Rome, has extorted the sincere admiration of a historian in general too blind to the true beauty of the Christian religion.^u The Bishop of Carthage had no scruple in sacrificing that which had been offered to give splendour to the worship of God, to the more holy object of alleviating human misery. In order to re-unite those who had been severed by the cruelty or the covetousness of the conquerors—the husbands from the wives, the parents from their children—he sold all the gold and silver vessels belonging to the churches of his diocese. Diseases and sicknesses followed this sudden and violent change of life. To mitigate these sufferings he converted two large churches into hospitals, furnished them with beds and mattresses, and with a daily allowance of food and medicine. The good bishop himself by night and day accompanied the physicians, visiting every bed, and adding the comforts of tender and affectionate sympathy and of gentle Christian advice, to the substantial gifts of food and the proper remedies.* The aged man

* Gibbon.

* Gibbon well describes this.

wore himself out in these cares. He may have been obnoxious on other accounts to the Arian rulers, and may have escaped the persecutions, with which Genseric and the Vandals afterwards afflicted the African Churches, by his timely death;^y but the judgement must be strangely infected with theological hatred which would suppose that his life was endangered by the jealousy of the Arians at these acts of true Christian mercy.^z

The sudden but brief and transitory effort of the Roman Empire, under Majorian, to arrest its hastening extinction, to resume something of its ancient energy, to mitigate the calamities, and avert the impending disorganization by wise legislation,^a by the remission of burthensome taxation, by the restoration of the municipal government in the cities—this last and exhausting paroxysm of strength continued till the close of the Pontificate of Leo. But it was too late; wisdom and virtue, at certain periods, are as fatal to those at the head of affairs, as improvidence and vice. He that would stem a torrent at its fall is swept away. Majorian perished through a lawless conspiracy, as though he had been the worst of tyrants. The last of the Roman Emperors who showed anything of the Roman in his character, and the Pontiff who, in a truly Roman spirit, chiefly founded her spiritual empire, were coincident in the period of their death.^b Majorian died in the year

^y Victor. Vit. de Persecut. Vandal.

^z This is the charitable conclusion of Baronius: "Quo hore Ariani successi, dolis eum quam plurimis voluerunt scipitis enecare. Quod, credo, prævidens Dominus passerem suum de manibus accepturum voluit liberare."—Annal. sub ann. 453.

^a Compare the laws of Majorian at the end of the Codex Theodosianus.

^b Leo was still occupied by the disputes in the East, which followed the condemnation of Eutychianism by the Council of Chalcedon, but this subject will be continuously treated in the following Book.

461, leaving the affairs of Rome and the still subject provinces in irrecoverable anarchy. One or two obscure names fill up the barren annals, till the Western Empire expired in the person of Augustulus. Leo died in the same year, leaving a regular succession of Pontiffs, who gradually rose to increasing temporal influence, which, nevertheless, was entirely subordinate to the barbarian kings of Italy, the Herulian and the Ostro-Gothic line, till, after the re-conquest of Italy by the Eastern Emperor, and the gradual abandonment of Justinian's conquests by his feebler successors, the Popes became great temporal potentates.*

Latin Christianity, at the close of the fourth, and during the first decennial period of the fifth century, had produced three of her great fathers—the founders of her doctrinal and disciplinarian system—Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine; Jerome, if not the father, the faithful and zealous guardian of her young monasticism, Ambrose of her sacerdotal authority, Augustine of her theology.

Before the middle of the fifth century, the two great founders of the Popedom, Innocent I. and Leo I. (singularly enough, each contemporary with one of the sieges and sacks of Imperial Rome by Teutonic barbarians), had laid deep the groundwork for the Western spiritual monarchy of Rome. That monarchy must await the close of the sixth century to behold her fourth Father, the author, if we may so speak, of her popular religion, and the third great founder of the Papal authority, not only over the minds, but over the hearts of men—Gregory the Great.

BOOK II.

CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.		WESTERN EMPERORS.		KINGS OF FRANKS.		VISIGOTHIC KINGS IN SPAIN.		VANDAL KINGS IN AFRICA.	
A.D.		A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
457. Leo I.	474	461. Severus	464			466. Euric	494	482. Genseric.	476
		464. Vacant.	496						
		467. Antemius	471						
		472. Olybrius							
474. Leo II.	491	Glycerius							
Zeno,		Nepos							
Basiliscus.		Augustulus	476					476. Hunneric.	481
		—		481. Clovis.	510	—			
		<i>Kings of Italy.</i>		kingdom di-					
		476. Odover the		vided		484. Alaric II.	507	484. Gondobald.	493
		Herulian.	493						
				510. Descendants					
				of Clovis					
				—					
491. Anastasius I.	518	493. Theodoric the		KINGS				495. Thrasimond.	522
		Ostrogoth	526	OF BURGUNDY.					
				451. Gunderic	472	507. Gesaric.	511		
				472. Gundebald and		511. Amalaric.	531		
(Vitalianus) 515				his brothers.	509				
518. Justin I	527			509. Sigismund	524			522. Hilderic.	530
				524. Gondemar	532				
				Conquered by				530. Giltmer.	534
				Western Franks				534. Conquered by	
								Justinian.	
527. Justinian.	565	526. Athalaric	534			531. Theudec.	548		
		534. Theodatus	536			548. Theodegisild	549		
		536. Vitiges.	540			549. Agila.	558		
		540. Theodebald.				558. Athanagild.	567		
		541. Aratic				567. Liuba.	572		
		Totila	553			572. Leovigild.	586		
		558. Teta.							
565. Justin II	578					586. Recared	611		
578. Tiberius	582								
582. Maurice	602								
602. Phocas	610								
EASTERN EMPIRE.									
554. Narses, Governor. 566									
Exarchs of Ravenna. Kings of Lombards.									
569. Longinus	584	568. Alboin	572						
584. Smeragdus	587	572. Cleophus	574						
587. Romanus	596	574. Duke-ruler	584						
590. Callinicus	603	584. Authais,							
		king	590						
		590. Agilulf	616						

BOOK III.



CHAPTER I.

Monophysitism.

LEO THE GREAT had not lived to witness the last feeble agonies of the Western Empire; he escaped the ignominious feeling which must have depressed the spirit of a Roman at the assumption of the strange title, the King of Italy, by a Barbarian: he was not called upon to render his allegiance, or to acknowledge the title of Odoacer.

The immediate successor of Leo was Hilarius, by birth a Sardinian. As deacon, Hilarius had **been** Nov. 19, 461. Hilarius. the representative of Leo at the Council of Ephesus. His firmness during those stormy debates displays a character unlikely to depart from the lofty pretensions of his predecessor. He reasserted in the East the unbending orthodoxy of Leo; in the West, he maintained, to the utmost extent, the authority which had been claimed over the churches of Gaul and Spain. Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne, on his death-bed, nominated Hermes as successor to his see. This precedent of a bishop making his see, as it were, a subject of testamentary bequest, seemed dangerous, though in this case Nov. 3, 462. the lawful assent had been obtained from the clergy and the people. Hilarius, at the head of a synod in Rome, condemned the practice, but for the

sentence of degradation substituted the lesser punishment, the deprivation of the right to confer ordination. In another dispute concerning the jurisdiction of the Metropolitans of Arles and Vienne over the Bishop of Die, the successor of St. Peter at least confirms, if he does not ground his whole ecclesiastical authority on the decrees of Christian Emperors. The Imperial sanction was wanting to ratify the edicts of the Apostolic Sec.^a The bishops of the province of Tarragona addressed Pope Hilarius in humbler language, and were treated, therefore, in a loftier tone of dictation.

Feb. 24, 464.

The only act of Hilarius which mingles him up with the temporal affairs of the age, is his solemn rebuke of the Emperor Anthemius, the sovereign who had been sent from Constantinople to rule the West, for presuming to introduce those maxims of toleration, to which his father-in-law, Marcian, had compelled unruly Constantinople; and even to look with favour on the few surviving partisans of the ancient philosophy, if not of the ancient religion. Under the reign of Anthemius, the old heathen festival, the Lupercalia, was still celebrated in Rome. The venerable rite which still commemorated at once the genial influences of the opening year, and the birth of Rome from the she-wolf which nursed her twin founders, was but slightly disguised to the worshipping Christians.^b

Sept. 467.

^a "Fratri enim nostro Leontio nihil constituti a sanctæ memoriæ decessore meo potuit abrogari, nihil voluit, quod honori ejus debetur, auferrî; quia *Christianorum quoque principum lege decretum est*, ut quidquid ecclesiarumque rectoribus, pio quiete omnium domini sacerdotum, etque ipsius observantiâ disciplinæ, i aufeendis

confusionibus apostolicæ sedis antistes suo pronunciasset examine, veneranter accipi, tenaciterque servari, cum summi plebibus caritas vestra cognosceret: nec unquam possent convelli, quæ et sacerdotali ecclesiasticâ præceptione fulcuntur *et regiâ*."—Hilari Papæ Epist. xi. Labbe, p. 1045.

^b Compare Gibbon, ch. xxxi.

It was Simplicius, the successor of Hilarius, born at
Feb. 25, 468. Tibur, who beheld the sceptre wrested from
Simplicius. the helpless hand of Augustulus, and heard
the demand of the allegiance of Italy from Odoacer, a
barbarian of uncertain race. The Papal Epistles dwell
Close of the only on the polemic controversies of the day,
Western on questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction or
Empire. ceremonial discipline: they rarely notice, even inci-
dentally, the great changes in the civil society around
them. We endeavour in vain to find any expression or
intimation of the feelings excited in a Roman of the
high station and influence of the Pope, at the total
extinction of that sovereignty which had governed the
world for centuries, and from which the Bishop of
Rome acknowledged himself to hold to some extent his
authority; by whose edicts Christianity had become the
established religion of the world and to which the
orthodox faith looked for its support by the legal pro-
scription of heretics; which had been at least the civil
lawgiver of the Church, and by whose grants she held
her vast increasing estates. How far was ~~she~~ the conscious
possession of a power, which might hereafter sway
opinions as widely as the Republic or the Empire had
enforced outward submission and by force of arms had
quelled every thought of resistance, accepted as a con-
solation for the departed name of sovereignty? How
far did Roman pride take refuge under the pretensions
of her Bishop to be the head of Christendom, from the
degradation of a foreign and barbarian yoke? Chris-
tendom, from all her monuments and records, might
seem to have formed a world of her own. Of the fall
of Augustulus, of the rise of Odoacer, we hear not a
word. Even in the midst of this extraordinary revo-
lution the active energy of the Popes seems concen-

tered on the East. The Bishop of Rome is busy in Constantinople, opposing the intrigues of Timotheus Ailurus, the Bishop of Alexandria, and jealously watching the ambition of Acacius, the Bishop of Constantinople, a more formidable enemy than Odoacer, as threatening the religious supremacy of Rome.* He takes deep interest in the changes on the throne of the East, congratulates the Emperor Zeno on his restoration, but it is because Zeno is an enemy to the Eutychian heretics, because he rises on the ruins of Basiliscus, the patron of the Monophysite faction.

For while the West, partly from her want of interest in these questions, partly from the unsettled state of public affairs, from the breaking up of Attila's kingdom, the Vandal invasion of Italy, the Visigothic conquests in Gaul and Spain, and the final extinction of the empire, reposed, as to its religious belief, under the paternal sway of Pope Leo and his successors, the distracted East, in all its great capitals, ^{Church in the East.} was still agitated with strife, that strife perpetually breaking out into violence and bloodshed. The Council of Chalcedon had commanded, had defined the orthodox creed in vain. Everywhere its decrees were received or rejected, according to the dominant party in each city, and the opinions of the reigning Emperor. On all the metropolitan thrones there were rival bishops, anathematizing each other, and each supported either by the civil power, by a part of the populace, or by the monks, more fierce and unruly than the unruly populace. For everywhere monks were at the head of the religious revolution which threw off the yoke of the Council of Chalcedon.^d In Jerusalem Theodosius, a monk, expelled

* Simplicii Epist. p. 1078.

ciani Epist. ad calc. Conc. Chalced.;

^d Leonis Epist. cix. et cxxv.; Mar- Evagrius, 11, 5. The latter writer
VOL. I.

the rightful prelate, Juvenalis; was consecrated by his party, and maintained himself by acts of violence, pillage, and murder, more like one of the lawless bandits of the country than a Christian bishop. The very scenes of the Saviour's mercies ran with blood shed in his name by his ferocious self-called disciples. In Alexandria the name of Dioscorus (who remained quiet till his death at Gangra, his place of exile) was still dear to most of the monks, and to many of the people, who asserted the champion of orthodox belief and Alexandrian dignity to have been sacrificed to the *Nestorian* Council of Chalcedon. A prelate named Proterius had been appointed, on the triumph of that Council, to the vacant see. The bold wit of the Alexandrian populace had always delighted in affixing nicknames upon the rulers and kings of Egypt; in their strong religious animosity, they scrupled not to profane their holy bishops with equally irreverent appellations. Timotheus, a monk, called Ailurus, the Weasel, perhaps because he was said to have slunk by night to the secret meetings of the rabble, or because he stole into the bishopric of another, was consecrated by the anti-Chalcedonian faction, as a rival metropolitan. We are impatient of these dreary and intricate feuds. That of Alexandria ended, it must not be said, for it might seem interminable, but came to a crisis, in the horrible assassination of Proterius. So little had centuries of Christianity tamed the savage populace of this great city, that the

says the difference between the two parties was between the two prepositions *propter* and *propterea*. Leo makes a remarkable admission. His words might have been misunderstood by those who

"non valentes in Græcum aptè et propriè à Latina transferre, cum in rebus subtilibus et difficilibus explicandis, vis sibi etiam in suâ linguâ disputatori quisque sufficiat."

Bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body treated with shameless indignity, and other enormities perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal^e Timotheus, however, is acquitted as to the guilt of participation in these monstrous crimes. But the Weasel did not assume the throne of Alexandria without a rival. Another Timotheus, called Solofaciolus, was set up (Timotheus the Weasel having been banished on the authority of the Emperor A.D. 460. Leo), after no long interval, by the Chalcedonian party.^f

At Antioch, some years later, a third monk, Peter, called from his humble birth and occupation the Fuller,^g with the apparent countenance of Zeno, the Emperor Leo's son-in-law, whom he had Antioch. accompanied during his wars in the East, began to intrigue with the discontented party in that city. He led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the street, which added to the "Thrice Holy" in the hymn, "who was crucified for us." In a short time Peter succeeded in expelling the Bishop Martyrius, who voluntarily abdicated his see.

Barsumas, the notorious leader of the monks in Constantinople, who had been driven from that city by the Council of Chalcedon, was not inactive during his exile. Throughout Syria he spread the charge of Nestorianism against the Council, and exasperated men's

^e καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀπογεύεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς θήρας φειδόμενοι ἐκείνου, ὃν ἔχειν μερίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐναγχος ἐνομίσθησαν.—Euvagrius, 11, 9, quoting the letter of the Bishops and Clergy to the Emperor Leo.

^f Timotheus was allowed to go to Constantinople to plead his cause;

thence he was dismissed into banishment.—S. Leon. Epist. ad Gennadium et ad Leonem Imper.

^g The history of Peter the Fuller is related differently; the time of his invasion of the church of Antioch is not quite certain.

minds against the prelates of that party. On one religious subject alone the conflicting East maintained its perfect unity, in the reverence, it may be said the worship, of the Hermit on the Pillar. Simeon Stylites had been observed by his faithful disciple to have remained motionless for three days in the same attitude of prayer. Not once had he stretched out his arms in the form of the cross; not once had he bowed his forehead till it touched his feet (a holy exploit, which his wondering admirers had seen him perform twelve hundred and forty-four times, and then lost their reckoning). The watchful disciple climbed the pillar: a rich odour saluted his nostrils; the saint was dead. The news reached Antioch. Ardaburius, general of the forces in the East, hastened to send a guard of honour, lest the neighbouring cities should seize—perhaps meet in desperate warfare for—the treasure of his body. Antioch, now one in heart and soul, sent out her Patriarch, with three other bishops, to lead the funeral procession. The body was borne on mules for three hundred stadia; a deaf and dumb man touched the bier, he burst out into a cry of gratulation. The whole city, with torches and hymns, followed the body. The Emperor Leo implored Antioch to yield to him the inestimable deposit. The Emperor implored in vain. Antioch, so long as she possessed the remains of Simeon, might defy all her enemies. In the same year, when Antioch thus honoured the funeral rites of him whom she esteemed the greatest of mankind, Rome was lamenting in deep and manly sorrow her Pontiff Leo. Contrast Simeon Stylites, now with one Emperor crouching at the foot of his pillar, and receiving his dull, incoherent words as an oracle, now with another, a man of higher character, supplicating for the possession of his

remains, and Pope Leo on his throne in Rome, and in the camp of Attila. Such were then Greek and Latin Christianity. Nor was the lineage of the Holy Simeon broken or contested. The sees of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, the throne of the East, might be the cause of long and bloody conflict. The hermit Daniel mounted his pillar at Anaplus near the mouth of the Euxine: in that cold and stormy climate, his body, instead of being burned up with heat, was rigid with frost. But he became at once the legitimate, acknowledged successor of Simeon, the Prophet, the oracle of Constantinople. Once he condescended to appear in the streets of Constantinople: his presence decided the fate of the Empire.^a

The religious affairs in the East were indissolubly blended with the political revolutions, to which the religious factions added their weight, and unquestionably did not mitigate the animosity. These revolutions were frequent and violent. Leo the Thracian, the successor of Marcian, throughout his long reign, adhered firmly to the Council of Chalcedon. Towards the close of his reign, the treacherous murder of Aspar the Patrician, and his son Ardaburius, to whom Leo had owed his throne; the violation of the Imperial word, solemnly given in order to lure Aspar from the sanctuary to which he had fled (the inviolability of the right of sanctuary Leo had just established by a statute); the same contempt of the

Revolutions
in Constanti-
nople. From
A.D. 457 to
474.

Death of
Marcian.

^a On Simeon, Antonii vit. S. S. Theodoret Lect., Evagri. i. 13; on Daniel, vit. Dan. Theodoret. This kind of asceticism was the admiration of the East to a later period. Eustathius of Thessalonica addressed a Stylites in the xiith century, admonishing the Saint against pride, yet at the same time asserting this to be the utmost height of religion. Eustathii Opuscula, Edit. Tafel, p. 182.

laws of hospitality (the murder took place at a banquet in the Imperial palace, to which he had invited Aspar and his son), all this execrable perfidy was vindicated to a large part of his subjects, because Aspar was an Arian.¹ The Eastern world was in danger of falling under the sway of the Cæsar Ardaburius, who was either an open Arian, or but a recent and suspicious convert. This was in itself enough to convict him and his partisans of treasonable designs, and to justify any measures which might avert the danger from the Empire. During the whole reign of Leo, Eutychianism had been repressed by the known orthodoxy of the Emperor.^k Timotheus the Weasel had been permitted, as has been said, through the weak and suspicious favour of Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople, to visit the court, but he had been repelled and sent into exile by the severe Emperor. But with the exception of the first disturbances excited at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, the reign of Leo the Thracian was one of comparative religious peace. Eutychianism hid its head in the sullen silence of the monasteries. With the contested empire on the death of Leo, the religious contests broke out in new fury. Zeno, who had married Leo's daughter, Ariadne, was driven from the throne by Basiliscus, the brother of Verina, the widow of Leo. With Basiliscus, the anti-Chalcedonian party rose to power. An Imperial encyclic letter branded with an anathema the whole proceedings at Chalcedon, and the letter of Pope Leo, as tainted with Nestorianism.

Emperor
Leo.

Zeno ex-
pelled by
Basiliscus
A.D. 476.

¹ Niceph. xv. 27.

^k A law of Leo betrays the fears of the government of these monkish factions: "Qui in monasteriis agunt, nepotestatem habeant a monasteriis ex-

eund." The force of law was necessary to compel these disciples of Paul and Antony to be what they had taken vows to be.

Everywhere the Eutychian bishops seized upon the sees, and expelled the rightful prelates. Peter the Fuller, who had for a time been excluded, re-ascended the throne of Antioch. Paul resumed that of Ephesus. Anastasius of Jerusalem rendered his allegiance. Timotheus the Weasel came from his exile to Constantinople, and ruled the Emperor Basiliscus with unrivalled sway.^m Acacius, the Bishop of Constantinople, was a man of great ability. He beheld the unwelcome presence, the increasing influence of the rival Patriarch of Alexandria, with jealous suspicion, and refused to admit him to the communion of the Church. Fierce struggles for power distracted Constantinople.ⁿ On one side were the Eutychian monks; on the other, the Bishop Acacius and a large part of the populace and of the monks of Constantinople, for fierce bands of monks now appeared on either side. But his most powerful supporter was the Hermit Daniel, who descended from the pillar, where he had received the suppliant visits of the former Emperor, to take part in these tumults, that pillar which more sober Christians might almost have mounted in order to rise above the turbid atmosphere of strife. With this potent ally the Bishop of Constantinople (probably indeed supported by the strong faction of the expelled Zeno) waged an equal war against the Emperor. Ere long the strange spectacle was presented of

^m See the triumphant reception of Timotheus in Constantinople, Evagr. hi. 4.

ⁿ The language of the Pope Simplicius shows the manner in which the hostile parties wrote of each other: "Comperi Timotheum parricidam, qui Ægyptiacæ pridem vastator Ecclesiæ, in morem Cain . . . ejectionis a facie Dei,

hoc est Ecclesiæ dignitate seclusus." . . . He then describes his resumption of the Alexandrian See: "Quo procul dubio Cain ipso longè detestabilior approbatur; ille siquidem a perpetrato semel facinore damnatus abstinuit, hic profectus ad crimina majora post pœnam." — Simplic. Epist. Labbe, 1070.

a Roman Emperor flying before a naked hermit, who had lost the use of his legs by standing for sixteen years on his column. Basiliscus too late revoked his encyclic letter. He fell, and Zeno resumed the power. The

Zeno emperor,
A.D. 477.

tide turned against the Monophysite or anti-Chalcedonian party. But the rest, though some bishops hastened to make their peace with the Emperor and with Acacius, contended obstinately against the stream. Stephanus, the Bishop of Antioch, was murdered in the church by the partisans of Peter the Fuller. Timotheus the Weasel, spared from all extreme chastisement on account of his age, died; but in his place arose another monk, Peter, called Mongus, or the Stammerer, and laid claim to the see of Alexandria. Timotheus Solofaciolus, however, under the Imperial authority, resumed the Patriarchate, and endeavoured to reconcile the heretics by Christian gentleness.* The Emperor Zeno beheld with commiseration and dismay his distracted empire; he determined, if possible, to assuage the animosities, and to reconcile the hostile factions. After a vain attempt to obtain the opinions of the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries, without assembling a new Council, a measure which experience had shown to

A.D. 482
Henoticon of
Zeno.

exasperate rather than appease the strife, Zeno issued his famous Henoticon, or Edict of Union. This edict was composed, it was believed, if not by Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople, under his direction and with his sanction. It aimed not at the reconciliation of the conflicting opinions, but hoped, by avoiding all expressions offensive to either party, to allow them

* Liberatus says that the heretics used to cry out as he passed, "Though we do not communicate with you, yet we love you."—Breviar. Baronius is indignant at this "nimia indulgentia" of the bishop (sub ann. 478).

to meet together in Christian amity: as if such terms had not become to both parties an essential part, perhaps the whole, of their Christianity.

The immediate effects of the Henoticon in the East might seem to encourage the fond hope of success. The feud between the rival Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria was for a time appeased. Acacius and Peter the Stammerer recognised their mutual claims to Christian communion. Calendion, the Chalcedonian Bishop of Antioch, had been banished to the African Oasis. Peter the Fuller had resumed the throne. Peter acceded to the Henoticon; and these three Patriarchal churches commended the Imperial scheme of union to the Eastern world.^p

It was but a transient lull of peace. The Henoticon, without reconciling the two original conflicting parties, only gave rise to a third: in Alex-^{Alexandria.} andria the two factions severed into three. One half of the Eutychian or anti-Chalcedonian party adhered to Peter the Stammerer; the other^{Three parties.} indignantly repudiated what they called the base concession of Peter; they were named the Acephali, without a head, as setting up no third prelate. The strong Chalcedonian party had nominated as successor to the mild Timotheus Solofaciolus, a man of a^{John Talajas.} different character. John Talajas, while at Constantinople, had been compelled by the provident, but vain precaution, no doubt, of Acacius, to pledge himself not to aspire to the see of Alexandria.^q The object of Acacius was to unite the Alexandrian Church under Peter the Stammerer, beneath the broad comprehension of the Henoticon. No sooner was Timotheus

^p Evagrius, iii. 26

^q Evagrius, on the authority of Zacharias.

dead, and John Talajas safe at Alexandria, than he accepted the succession of Timotheus. On the union between Acacius and Peter the Stammerer, John Talajas fled to Rome; he was welcomed as a second Athanasius.

For now a question had arisen, which involved the Question of Roman supremacy. Bishops of Rome, not merely as dignified arbiters on a high and profound metaphysical question of the faith, but, vital to their power and dignity, plunged them into the strife as ardent and implacable combatants. The Roman Pontiffs had already, at least from the time of Innocent I., asserted their inalienable supremacy on purely religious grounds, as successors of St. Peter. If, as in the recent act of Hilarius, they had appealed to the laws of the empire, as confirmatory of that supremacy, it was to enforce more ready and implicit obedience. But with the world at large the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome rested solely on her civil supremacy. The Pope was head of Christendom as Bishop of the first city in the world. Already Constantinople had put forth claims to co-equal ecclesiastical, as being now of co-equal temporal dignity. This claim had been ratified by the great Œcumenic Council of Chalcedon,—that Council which had established the inflexible line of orthodoxy between the divergent heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. This was but the supplementary act, it was asserted, of a small and factious minority, who had lingered behind the rest; but, it appeared upon the records, it boasted the authority of the unanimous Council.^r The ambition of Acacius, now, under Zeno, sole and undisputed Bishop of Constantinople, was equal to his ability. He seemed watching the gradual fall of the Western

Empire, the degradation of Rome from the capital of the world, which would leave Constantinople no longer the new, the second, but rather the only Rome upon earth. The West, in the person of Anthemius, had received an emperor appointed by Constantinople; the Western Empire at one moment seemed disposed to become a province of the East. Acacius had already obtained from the Emperor (we must reascend in the course of our history to connect the East with the West), Leo the Thracian, who had ruled between Marcian and Zeno, a decree confirming to the utmost all the privileges of a Patriarchate claimed by Constantinople. In that edict Constantinople assumed the significant and threatening title of "Mother of all Christians and of the Orthodox Religion." The Pope Simplicius had protested against this usurpation, but his protest is lost. The aspiring views of Acacius were interrupted for a short time by his fall under the Emperor Basiliscus; but his triumph (an unwonted triumph of a Bishop of Constantinople over an Emperor), his unbounded favour with Zeno, might warrant the loftiest expectations. As the acknowledged and victorious champion of orthodoxy, Acacius could now take the high position of a mediator. In the Henoticon Zeno the Emperor spoke his language, and in that edict appeared a manifest desire to assuage the discords of the East, and to combine the Churches in one harmonious confederacy. On the murder of Stephanus of Antioch, Acacius had consecrated his successor; a step against which the Pope Simplicius, who was watching all his actions, sent a strong remonstrance. Before the publication of the Henoticon, the Western Empire had departed from Rome; but though her political supremacy, even her political independence

A. D. 479. Remonstrance of Simplicius.

was lost, she would not tamely abandon her spiritual dignity. For Rome, in the utmost assertion of her power against the Bishop of Constantinople, might depend on the support of above half the East; of all who were discontented with the Henoticon; and who, in the absorbing ardour of the strife, would not care on what terms they obtained the alliance of the Bishop of Rome, so that alliance enabled them to triumph over their adversaries. The dissatisfaction with the Henoticon comprehended totally opposite factions, Factions in the East. —the followers of Nestorius and of Eutyches, who were impartially condemned on all sides;—and the ecclesiastics, who considered it an act of presumption in the Emperor to assume the right of legislating in spiritual matters, a right complacently admitted when ratifying or compulsorily enforcing ecclesiastical decrees, and usually adopted without scruple on other occasions by the party with which the Court happened to side. But the strength of the malcontents was the high Chalcedonian or orthodox party, who condemned the Henoticon as tainted with Eutychianism, and denounced Acacius as holding communion with Eutychian Prelates, and therefore himself justly suspected of leaning to that heresy. In Constantinople the more formidable of the monks were of this party; the Bishops of Rome addressed more than once the clergy and the archimandrites of that city, as though assured of their sympathy against the Bishop and the Emperor. John Talajas, the exiled Bishop of Alexandria, filled Rome with his clamours. The Pope Simplicius addressed a remonstrance to Acacius, to which Acacius, who to former letters of the Bishop of Rome had condescended no answer, coldly replied that he knew nothing of such a Bishop of Alexandria; that he was in communion

with the rightful bishop, Peter Mongus, who, like a loyal subject, had subscribed the Emperor's Edict of Union.^s

At this juncture died Pope Simplicius. On the vacancy of the see occurred a singular scene. March, A.D. 483. Death of Simplicius The clergy were assembled in St. Peter's. In the midst of them stood up Basilius, the Patri-
 cian and Prefect of Rome, acting as Vicegerent of Odoacer, ~~the~~ barbarian King. He appeared by the command of his master, and by the admonition of the deceased Simplicius, to take care that the peace of the city was not disturbed by any sedition or tumult during the election. That election could not take place with-
 out the sanction of his Sovereign. He proceeded, as the Protector of the Church from loss and injury by Churchmen, to proclaim the following edict: "That no one, under the penalty of anathema, should Decree of Odoacer. alienate any farm, buildings, or ornaments of the Churches; that such alienation by any Bishop present or future was null and void." So important did this precedent appear, so dangerous in the hands of ~~those~~ schismatics who would even in those days limit the sacerdotal power, that nearly twenty years after, a fortunate occasion was seized by the Pope Symmachus to annul this decree. In a synod of Bishops at Rome, the edict was rehearsed, interrupted by protests of the Bishops at this presumptuous interference of the laity with affairs of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.^t The authenticity of the decree was not called in question; it was declared invalid, as being contrary to the usages of the Fathers, enacted on lay authority, and as not ratified by the signature of any Bishop at Rome. The same

^s Liberat. Breviar.

^t Synodus Romana. Labbe, sub ann. 502.

Council, however, acknowledged its wisdom by re-enacting its ordinance against the alienation of Church property.

Felix, by birth a Roman, succeeded to the vacant
Felix III.
Pope.
A.D. 483. see. He inherited the views and passions, as well as the throne of Simplicius and his strife with the East. His first act was an indignant rejection of the Henoticon, as an insult to the Council of Chalcedon; as an audacious proceeding of the Emperor Zeno, who dared to dictate articles of faith; as a seed-plot of impiety.^a He anathematized all the Bishops who had subscribed this edict. At the head of a Roman synod, Felix addressed a strong admonitory letter to Acacius of Constantinople, and another, in a more persuasive tone, to the Emperor Zeno. These letters were sent into the East by two Bishops, Misenus and Vitalis, as Legates of Pope Felix. To Peter the Fuller was directed another letter, arraigning him as involved in every heresy which had ever afflicted the Church, or with something worse than the worst.^x Whether he

^a Theodorus Lector.

^x The introduction by Peter the Fuller of "who wast crucified for us," after the angelic hymn, the Holy, Holy, Holy, struck the ears of the orthodox with horror. Felix relates with all the earnestness of faith, and with all the authority of his position, the miraculous origin of this hymn in its simple form. During an earthquake at Constantinople, while the whole people were praying in the open air, an infant was visibly rapt to heaven, in the sight of the whole assembly and of the Bishop Proclus; and after staying there an hour, descended back to the earth, and informed the people that he had heard the whole host of

angels singing those words. It was not merely that the words, added at Antioch, left it doubtful which of the Persons of the Trinity was crucified for us; the term was equally impious as regarded any one of those consubstantial, uncreated, invisible, impassible Beings. καθὸ τοῦτον ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ἐστι τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοούσιος, καὶ εἰς τῆς ἀδιαίρετου τριάδος, ἔκτιστος καὶ ἀθέατος, ἐμεμενῆκει ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀθάνατος. Τὸ οὖν ἔκτιστον καὶ ἀθάνατον τῇ κτίσει μὴ σύνταττε, καὶ τὸν τῆς πολυθείας λόγον μὴ κράνυνε, διὰ τὸ λέγειν τεθνήσκει τὸν ἕνα τῆς τριάδος—
 Epist. Felic. III. ad Petr. Full., Labbe, 1058.

awaited any reply from the refractory Bishop or not seems doubtful; but he proceeded to fulminate a sentence of deposition and excommunication against Peter in his own name, and to assume that this sentence would be ratified by Acacius of Constantinople.

Excommunicates Peter the Fuller.

The Legate Bishops, Misenus and Vitalis, were attacked at Abydus, and their papers seized. At Constantinople they were compelled, bribed, or betrayed into communion with Peter the Stammerer; at least they were present, and without protest, at the divine service when the name of Peter was read in the diptychs as lawful Bishop of Alexandria. On their return they were branded as traitors by Felix at the head of a synod at Rome, and degraded from their episcopal office. Felix proceeded (his tardiness had been sharply rebuked by the monks of Constantinople, especially the Sleepless monks,^y whose archimandrite Cyril and his whole brotherhood were the implacable enemies of Acacius) to issue the sentence of

Excommunicates Acacius of Constantinople.

excommunication against the Bishop of Constantinople. The sentence was pronounced, not on account of heresy, but of obstinate communion with heretics—with Peter of Alexandria, who had been condemned by Pope Simplicius for his violent conduct to the

July 28, 484.

Papal Legates, and his contemptuous refusal to admit the third ambassador, Felix the Defensor, to his presence. Acacius was declared to be deprived, not merely of his episcopal, but of his priestly honours, separated from the communion of the faithful; and this anathema, an unusual form, was declared irrevocable by any power.^z But how was this process to be served on the

^y Ἀκοίμητοι.

^z "Nunquamque anathematis vinculis evendus."—Epist. Felic. ad

Acacium. Felix, in a subsequent letter to Zeno, maintains this implacable doctrine: "Unde divino iudicio nulla

Bishop of Constantinople? Acacius was strong in the favour of the Emperor Zeno. It is remarkable that, while he thus precipitately proceeds to the last extremity against his rival Bishop, the Emperor is still sacred against the condemnation of the Bishop of Rome. Zeno had issued the Henoticon. Zeno had, by so doing, usurped the power of dictating religious articles to the clergy. Zeno, if he had not ordered, sanctioned all this re-establishment of the Bishops who had not acceded to the Council of Chalcedon; but to Zeno the language of the Pontiff is respectful, and bordering on adulation. The monks, the allies of Felix, were ready to encounter any peril. One of the Sleepless fastened the fatal parchment to the dress of Acacius, as he was about to officiate in the Church. Acacius quietly proceeded in the holy ceremony. Suddenly he paused; with calm, clear voice, he ordered the name of Felix, Bishop of Rome, to be struck out of the roll of bishops in communion with the East. The ban of Rome was encountered by the ban of Constantinople.^a

Aug. I, A.D.
481
Acacius ex-
communi-
cates Felix.

The schism divided the Churches of the East and West for nearly forty years, down to the Pontificate of Hormisdas and the empire of Justinian, under whose sway Italy became subject to the Byzantine sovereign. Overtures of reconciliation were made, but Felix at least adhered inflexibly to his demand, that the name of Acacius should be erased from the diptychs. The great Eastern Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, utterly disregard-

Schism of
forty years

tenus potuit, etiam cum id malleamus, | to hell.

absolvi."—Epist. xi. Writing to Fravitta, his successor, he intimates that no doubt Acacius has gone, like Judas,

^a Julius, the messenger of Felix, quailed before the danger, or was bribed by Byzantine gold.

ing the anathema of Rome, continued in communion with Acacius and his successors. Acacius, notwithstanding the incitements to spiritual rebellion addressed by the Bishop of Rome to his clergy and to the turbulent monks, maintained his throne till his death.^b

Acacius (I trace rapidly the history of Eastern Christianity until the reunion with the West) was succeeded by Fravitta or Flavitta, who occupied the throne but for four months.^c The election then fell on Euphemius

A.D. 489.
Fravitta
Bishop of
Constanti-
nople.

Euphemius.

The Bishops of Constantinople might defy the spiritual thunders of Rome, but though Acacius had once triumphed over an usurping Emperor, in daring to conflict with the established Imperial authority they but betrayed their own weakness. During the reign of the Emperor Anastasius, two Bishops of Constantinople, having justly or unjustly incurred the Imperial displeasure, were degraded from their sees. The Emperor Anastasius has been handed down to posterity with the praise of profound piety, and the imputation of Eutychianism, Arianism, and even Manicheism. Anastasius ascended the throne, though Euphemius had exerted all his authority to prevent his elevation, through his marriage with the Empress Ariadne. It is said that an old quarrel, while Anastasius was yet in a humbler station, rankled in both their hearts. The Bishop had threatened to shave the head of the domestic of the palace, and expose him as a spectacle to the people. The mother of Anastasius and his mother's brother had been Arians, and Euphemius took care that dark sus-

^b Felicis Epist. x. xi.: ad Clerum et Plebem Constantin. et ad Monachos Constantin. et Bithyniæ.

^c Felix addressed a letter to Fravitta adjuring him to abandon the cause of Acacius and Peter, and unite with Rome

picious of Anastasius on this vital point should be disseminated in the empire. But Anastasius, in the conscientious conviction of his own orthodoxy, and that virtue which had called forth the popular acclamation, "Reign as you have lived," dared to enforce despotic toleration. The East was now divided into four religious parties. 1. Those who, with the Roman Pontiff and the monks of Constantinople, held inflexibly to the Council of Chalcedon, and demanded the distinct recognition of its doctrines. These were not content with the anathema against Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus: they insisted on including under the malediction Acacius and Peter the Stammerer.^d 2. Those who, holding the tenets of Chalcedon, had yet subscribed the Henoticon, and for the sake of peace would not compel the acceptance of the Chalcedonian decrees. Among these were Euphemius of Constantinople before the accession of Anastasius, and at first his successor Macedonius, and the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem; all the four great Prelates had subscribed the Henoticon. 3. Those who subscribed the Henoticon, and abhorred the decrees of Chalcedon; these were chiefly the Patriarch of Alexandria, with the Bishops of Egypt and Libya. 4. The Acephali, the Eutychian party, who held the Council of Chalcedon to be a Nestorian conclave, and cherished the memory of Dioscorus and of Eutyches. Anastasius issued his mandate, that no bishop should compel a reluctant people to adhere to the Council of Chalcedon; no bishop should compel a people which adhered to the Council of Chalcedon to abandon its principles. Many who infringed on this law of Imperial charity were

Four parties
in the East

^d Evagrius, iii. 31.

deposed with impartial severity. Euphemius had extorted from the Emperor Anastasius, as a kind of price for his accession, a written asseveration of allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon, and an oath that he would maintain inviolate those articles which he had been with difficulty compelled to surrender. Euphemius, it might seem, as a rebuke against the comprehensive measures of the Emperor, held a synod, in which the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were confirmed; but though this might be among the secret causes, it was not the crime for which Anastasius demanded the degradation of Euphemius.^e

The Isaurian rebellion disturbed the earlier period of the reign of Anastasius; it lasted for five years. The Bishop Euphemius tampered in treasonable proceedings; he was accused of traitorous correspondence, or at least of betraying the secrets of the state to these formidable rebels. The Emperor summoned a Council; Euphemius was deposed, sent into exile, and died in obscurity: he has left a doubtful fame. The Latin writers hesitate whether he was a martyr or a heretic.^f

A.D. 495.

Macedonius was promoted to the vacant See.^g Macedonius, a man of gentle but too flexible disposition, began his prelacy by an act of unusual courtesy to his fallen predecessor. He performed the act of degradation with forbearance. Before he saluted him in the Baptistry, he took off the episcopal habiliment, and appeared in the dress of a Priest he supplied the exile with money, borrowed money, for his immediate use. Macedonius subscribed the

Macedonius
Bishop of
Constanti-
nople.

^e Evagrius, Theophanes, p. 117. Victor, xvi. xvii.

^f Walch, p. 974.

^g Theophanes.

Henoticon, and still the four great Patriarchates .. held in Christian fellowship by that bond of union. At the command of the Emperor, Macedonius undertook the hopeless task of reconciling the four great Monasteries, among them that of the Akoimetoï, and the female convent then presided over by Matrona, with the communion of the Church under the Henoticon. The inflexible monks would give up no letter of the Council of Chalcedon—they declared themselves prepared rather to suffer exile.^b Matrona, a woman of the austere life, endured with patience, which wrought strongly on men's minds, acts of violence used by a Deacon to compel her to submission. The mild Macedonius, instead of converting them, was himself overawed by their rigour into a strong partisan of the Council of Chalcedon; he inclined to make overtures to the Bishop of Rome, Gelasius I.: but Anastasius prohibited such proceedings; he had declared himself resolved against all innovations.

The Eastern wars occupied for some years the mind of Anastasius. In the mean time the compressed fires of religious discord were struggling to burst forth and convulse the realm. Macedonius had hardened into a stern, almost a fanatic partisan of the Council of Chalcedon. John Nicetas had ascended the throne of Alexandria: he subscribed the Henoticon, but declared that it was an insufficient exposition of the true doctrine, as not explicitly condemning the Council of Chalcedon. Flavianus filled the See of Antioch—Elias that of Jerusalem. Elias was disposed to reject the Council of Chalcedon; Flavianus was inclined to rest on the neutral ground of the Henoticon. But the Monophysite party in Syria, which seemed greatly

Confusion at
Antioch

^b Theophanes, *Chronog.*, ed. Bekker, i. 219.

reduced in numbers, and content to seclude itself within the peaceful monasteries, suddenly having found a bold and reckless leader, burst out in fierce insurrection. Xenaïas,¹ or Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis, began to agitate the whole region by accusing Flavianus as a Nestorian. Flavianus, to exculpate himself, issued his anathema against Nestorius and his opinions. Xenaïas imperiously demanded the anathema, not of Nestorius alone, but of Ibas, Theodoret of Cyrus, and a host of other bishops, who from time to time had been charged with Nestorianism. Flavianus resisted. But the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus sprung up on all sides. Eleusinius, a bishop of Cappadocia, and Nicias of the Syrian Laodicea, joined their ranks. Flavianus consented to involve all whom they chose thus to denounce in one sweeping malediction. Xenaïas, flushed with his victory, still refused to absolve the timid bishop from the hated name of Nestorian. He required his explicit condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and of all who asserted the two natures in Christ. Flavianus still struggled in the toils of these inexorable polemics, who were resolved to convict him, subscribe what he might, as a secret Nestorian. Swarms of monks crowded from the district of Cynegica, and filling the streets of Antioch, insisted on the direct condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon and the letter of Pope Leo.^k The people of Antioch rose in defence of their bishop, slew some of the monks, and drove the rest into the Orontes, where many lost their lives. Another party of monks from Coelesyria, where Flavianus himself had dwelt in

¹ Xenaïas, interpreted by the hostile monks of Jerusalem, "The stranger to Catholic doctrine."

^k Evagrius. iii. 31, 32.

the convent of Talmognon, hastened to form a guard for his person.

The Emperor Anastasius in the mean time on his return from the East found Macedonius, instead of a mild assertor of the Henoticon, at the head of one, and that the most dangerous and violent of the religious factions. Rumours were industriously spread abroad, that the Emperor's secret Manicheism had been confirmed in the East. A Persian painter had been employed in one of the palaces, and had covered the walls, not with the orthodox human forms worshipped by the Church, but with the mysterious and symbolic figures of the Manichean heresy. Anastasius, insulted by the fanatic populace, was escorted to the Council and to the churches by the Prefect at the head of a strong guard. Anastasius was driven by degrees (an Emperor of his commanding character should not have been driven) to favour the opposing party. John, Patriarch of Alexandria, sent to offer, it is said, two hundred pounds of gold, as a tribute, a subsidy, or a bribe, to induce the Emperor to abrogate the Council of Chalcedon. John, however, publicly maintained the neutrality of the Henoticon, neither receiving nor repudiating the Council. His legates were received with honour. Anastasius compelled the Bishop Macedonius to admit them to communion. Xenaias, the persecutor of Flavianus, was likewise received with honour. Worse than all, two hundred Eastern monks, headed by Severus, were permitted to land in Constantinople: they here found an honourable reception. Other monks of the opposite faction swarmed from Palestine. The two black-cowled armies watched each other for some months, working in

secret on their respective partisans.^m At length they came to a rupture; and in their strife, which he either dared not, or did not care to A.D. 511. control the throne, the liberty, the life itself of the Emperor were in peril. The Monophysite monks in the church of the Archangel within the palace broke out after the "Thrice Holy," with the burthen added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, "who wast crucified for us." The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavoured to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild, fierce fray; the divine presence of the Emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The Bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, Tumults in Constantinople. children, poured out from all quarters; the monks, with their Archimandrites, at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war-cry "It is the day of martyrdom. Let us not desert our spiritual Father. Down with the tyrant! the Manichean! he is unworthy of the throne." The gates of the palace were barred against the furious mob; the imperial galleys were manned, ready for flight to the Asiatic shore. The Emperor was reduced to the humiliation of receiving the Bishop Macedonius, whom he had prohibited from approaching his presence, as his equal, almost as his master. As Macedonius passed along, the populace hailed him as their beloved father;

^m Each party of course throws the blame of the insurrection on the other. The later writers, who are all of the orthodox party, ascribe it to the Syrian monks. Evagrius (iii. c. 44) quotes a letter of Severus, written before he was Bishop of Antioch, charging the whole disturbance on Macedonius and the clergy of Constantinople.

even the military applauded. Macedonius rebuked the Emperor for his hostility to the Church. Anastasius condescended to dissemble: peace was restored with difficulty.

Macedonius seems to have been of feeble character, unfit to conduct this internecine strife between the Patriarchate and the Empire for supreme authority. Enemies would not be wanting, even had the strife not been for religion, to the enemy of the Emperor: and all acts of enmity to the Patriarch, whether sanctioned or not by the Emperor, would be laid to his charge. An accusation of loathsome incontinence was brought forward against the Bishop; he calmly refuted it by proving its impossibility. His life was attempted; he pardoned the assassin. But this Christian gentleness softened into infirmity. One day he weakly subscribed a Creed, in which he recognised only the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople; his silence about those of Ephesus and Chalcedon implied his rejection of their authority. His monkish masters broke out in furious invectives. The Patriarch stooped to appear before them in the monastery of Saint Dalmatius; and not merely expressed his adhesion to the Council of Chalcedon, he uttered his anathema against all recusants of its decrees. The Emperor had been silently watching his opportunity. The Bishop was seized by night; without tumult, without resistance, he was conveyed to the Asiatic shore, thence into banishment at Euchaita, his predecessor's place of exile. A well-chosen synod of bishops declared the deposition of Macedonius;ⁿ Timotheus was elected

A.D. 511
Deposition
and exile of
Macedonius.

ⁿ Evagrius intimates that Macedonius was persuaded to a voluntary abdication. According to Theophanes (Edd. Bekker, i. 240) Anastasius en-

Bishop of Constantinople. Timotheus signed the Henoticon; he went further, he laid his curse on the Council of Chalcedon. Timotheus was acknowledged by Flavianus of Antioch, by John of Alexandria, and by Elias of Jerusalem. But this concession secured not the throne of Flavianus. The Monophysite monk Severus, who had stirred up the populace of Alexandria and of Constantinople to religious riot, and had won the favour of Anastasius as acquiescing in the Henoticon, now appeared in Antioch as the rival of Flavianus. Flavianus was deposed, Severus was bishop. He would now no longer keep on the mask; he condemned in the strongest terms the Council of Chalcedon. The monkish party, which had been persecuted by, and in turn persecuted Flavianus, and to which he had in vain made such ignoble concessions, was dominant A D 513. in Antioch: Severus ruled supreme. At Jerusalem the orthodox were the strongest: and Elias, who would not go all lengths with them, was likewise compelled to abdicate his see. Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or, where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with Christian blood.

In Constantinople it was not the throne of the Bishop, but that of the Emperor which trembled to its base. Anastasius, who had so nobly and successfully wielded the arms of the Empire against the Persians, found his power in Constantinople, in his Asiatic provinces, in his European dominions, crumbling beneath him. His foes were not on the frontier, they

deavoured to gain possession of the them. Macedonius sealed them up original registers of the Council of and put them in a place of safety. Chalcedon, to destroy or to corrupt

Constanti-
nople again in
insurrection

were at the gates of Constantinople, in Constantinople, in his palace. He was now eighty years old. The martial courage which he had displayed in his Eastern campaigns might seem decayed; his aged hand could no longer hold with the same equable firmness the balance of religious neutrality; it may have trembled towards the Monophysite party; he may have brought something of the irritability and obstinacy of age into the contest. The year after the exile of Macedonia,

A.D. 512.

Constantinople, at the instigation of the clergy and the monks, broke out again in religious insurrection. The blue and green factions of the Circus—such is the language of the times—gave place to these more maddening conflicts. The hymn of the Angels in Heaven was the battle-cry on earth; the signal for human bloodshed. Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire; the officers of the crown insulted; pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city. A peasant who had turned monk was torn from the palace of the favourite Syrian minister of Anastasius, Marinus (he was accused of having introduced the profane burthen to the angelic hymn); his head was struck off, carried about on a pole, with shouts, “Behold the enemy of the Trinity.”^o The hoary Emperor appeared in the Circus, and commanded the heralds to announce to the people that he was prepared to abdicate the Empire, if they could agree in the choice of his successor. The piteous spectacle soothed the fury of the people; they entreated Anastasius to resume the diadem. But the blood of two of his ministers was demanded as a sacrifice to appease their vengeance.^p

^o Evagrius, iii. 44.

^p The Pope Gelasius writes to the Emperor, “You fear the people of Con-

stantinople, who are attached to the name of Acacius; the people of Constantinople have preferred Catholic

But it is not insurrection in Constantinople alone, the empire is in revolt on the question of the two natures in Christ. The first great religious war, alas for many centuries not the last! imperils the tottering throne of Anastasius. The Thracian Vitalianus is in open rebellion; obtains a great victory over the Imperial general Hypatius; wastes Thrace, depopulates the whole country—the whole realm—up to the gates of Constantinople. He is before the city at the head of 60,000 men. His banner, his war-cry, is that of religious orthodoxy; he proclaims himself the champion, not of an oppressed people, of a nobility indignant at the tyranny of their sovereign, but of the Council of Chalcedon. Cries are heard within the city (not obscurely traced to the clergy and the monks) proclaiming Vitalianus Emperor; and the army of this first religious war in Christendom is composed chiefly of Huns and Barbarians, a great part of them still heathens. But Vitalianus had allies in the West: from some obscure quarrel, or from jealousy of the Emperor of the East, he boasts the alliance of Theodoric, the Arian Ostrogoth; as the champion of orthodoxy he boasts too the countenance of Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome.^a

truth to the cause of their bishops Macedonius (then supposed to be unsound) and Nestorius. You have suppressed their tumults in the games, you will control them if they break out in religious insurrection." A singular testimony to the two great rival causes which roused the mob of Constantinople to mutiny.

* The accounts of these transactions, and their dates, are confused, almost irreconcilable. According to Evagrius

(iii. 43), Vitalianus was defeated in a naval battle, and fled in a single ship: according to Theophanes and others, he dictated terms of peace, the restoration of the bishops, and the Council of Heraclea. These terms Anastasius perfidiously violated, declaring that an emperor was justified, more than justified, in swearing to treaties, and breaking his oath to preserve his power,—*ὁ δὲ παρὰ νομος ἀναιδῶς ἔλεγεν νόμον εἶναι κελεύοντα βασιλέα κατ' ἀνάγκη*

The grey hairs of Anastasius were again brought down to shame and sorrow; he must stoop to an ignominious peace. If we are to credit the monastic historians, the end aimed at and attained by this insurrection, which had desolated provinces and caused the death of thousands of human beings, was a treaty which promised the re-establishment of Macedonius and Flavianus on the archiepiscopal thrones of Constantinople and Antioch; and the summoning a Council at Heraclea, in which Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome, was to appear by his legates, and no doubt hoped to dictate the decrees of the assembly.

The few last inglorious years of the reign of Anastasius, its dark close, his miserable death, his damnation, according to his relentless foes, must be reserved for the period when the Bishop of Rome (Hormisdas) appears in a commanding character in the arena of Constantinople: and if he does not terminate, prepares the termination of the schism of above forty years between Eastern and Western Christianity.

We turn away with willingness from the dismal and wearisome period, in which, in the East, all that is noble and generous in religious conviction disappears and gives place to dark intrigues and ignorant fury. Men suffer all the degradation and misery, incur all the sin of persecution almost without the lofty motive of honest zeal. It is a time of fierce and busy polemics, without a great writer. The Henoticon is a work of some skill, of some adroitness, in attempting to reconcile, in eluding, evading, theological

κην ἐπιорκεῖν καὶ ψεύδεσθαι. ταῦτα δὲ παρανομώτατος μανιχαϊσθῶν.—p. 248. I think, with Gibbon, following

Tillemont and older authorities, that there is no doubt of the two insurrections in Constantinople.

difficulties; it is subtle to escape subtleties. But there was no vigorous and manly, even if intolerant writer, like Cyril of Alexandria, whom we contemplate with far different estimation in his acts and in his writings.

But that which is the characteristic sign of the times, as a social and political, as well as a religious phenomenon, is the complete dominion assumed The influence of the monks, by the monks in the East over the public mind, and the depravation of monasticism from its primal principles. Those who had forsaken the world aspire to rule the world. The minds which are to be absolutely estranged from earth mingle in its most furious tumults. Instead of total seclusion from the habits and pursuits of men, the Cœnobites sweep the streets of the great cities in armed bodies, displaying an irregular valour which sometimes puts to shame the languid patriotism of the Imperial soldiery. Even the Eremites, instead of shrouding themselves in the remotest wilderness, and burying themselves in the darkest and most inaccessible caverns, mount their pillars in some conspicuous place, even in some place of public resort. While they seem to despise the earth below, and to enjoy the undisturbed serenity of heaven, they are not unconscious that they are the oracles as well as the objects of amazement to the admiring multitudes around; that Emperors come to consult them as seers and prophets, as well as infallible interpreters of divine truth. They even descend into the cities to become spiritual demagogues. The monks, in fact, exercise the most complete tyranny, not merely over the laity, but over bishops and patriarchs, whose rule, though nominally subject to it, they throw off whenever it suits their purposes. Those who might seem the least qualified, from their vague and abstract devotion, to decide questions which depended on niceties

of language, on the finest rhetorical distinctions, are the dictators of the world. Monks in Alexandria, monks in Antioch, monks in Jerusalem, monks in Constantinople, decide peremptorily on orthodoxy and heterodoxy. The bishops themselves cower before them. Macedonius in Constantinople, Flavianus in Antioch, Elias in Jerusalem, condemn themselves, and abdicate or are driven from their sees. Persecution is universal; persecution even means of violence and cruelty; the only restriction is in whose hands is the power to persecute. In Antioch, Xenaïas (Philoxenus, a famous name) justifies his insurrection by the persecutions which he has endured; Flavianus bitterly and justly complains of the persecutions of Xenaïas. Bloodshed, murder, treachery, assassination, even during the public worship of God,—these are the frightful means by which each party strives to maintain its opinions, and to defeat its adversary. Ecclesiastical and civil authority are alike paralysed by combinations of fanatics ready to suffer or to inflict death, utterly unapproachable by reason. If they had not mingled in the fray, peace might perhaps have been restored with no serious detriment to orthodox doctrine. If in the time of Zeno there had been no monks, no Acoimetoï, in Constantinople; if these fanatics had not been in treasonable correspondence with strangers, and supported by the Bishop of Rome—temperate and orthodox bishops like Macedonius and Flavianus might have allayed the storm. The evil lay partly in the mode of life; the seclusion, which fostered both ignorance and presumption, and magnified insignificant matters to questions of spiritual life and death; and the strong corporate spirit, which gave a consciousness of strength which bound them together as one man in whatever cause they might espouse. The

Emperor might depose a busy and refractory bishop, what could be done with a fraternity of a thousand men? They had already the principle of organization, union, and mutual confidence, and arms in their hands. They became legions. It is at the head of such an army that Severus, a stranger, makes himself formidable in Constantinople. A more powerful adverse army heads the mob of Constantinople and reduces the Emperor Anastasius to beg his crown, if not his life. Relying on these internal allies in the heart of his enemy's camp, Vitalianus besieges Constantinople, and dictates a capitulation, embodying their demands and those of their acknowledged head, the Bishop of Rome. Alexandria is at the mercy of such hosts, who pour in from the surrounding monasteries on all sides. Even during the last years of Anastasius, at the election of the bishop, another Dioscorus, the chief Imperial officer, is slain in the streets. Hosts of monks encounter in Syria, *meets* in the field of battle, consider that zeal divine with which they strive, not to instruct and enlighten, but to compel each other to subscribe the same confession, each slaying and dying in unshaken assurance that eternal salvation depended on the proper sense of the words "in" and "out of;" the acceptance or rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, including its dire anathemas.* To monasticism may unquestionably be attributed the obstinate continuance, perhaps the fury, of the Monophysite war. We shall hereafter

* I have incorporated with my own observations many sentences from a passage in a writer of the old German school, Walch, who, having investigated the whole of these transactions with unrivalled industry and candour,

and with the almost apathetic impartiality of his school, seems suddenly to break out into something approaching to eloquence. Walch, *Ketzer-Geschichte*, vol. vii.

encounter monasticism in the West in another character, as compensating, at least in a great degree, for its usurpation of the dignity of a higher and holier Christianity, by becoming the guardian of what was valuable, the books and arts of the old world; as the missionary of what was holy and Christian in the new civilisation; as the chief maintainer, if not the restorer of agriculture in Italy; as the cultivator of the forests and morasses of the north; as the apostle of the heathens which dwelt beyond the pale of the Roman empire.

We are again in the West, reascending and passing in review Latin Christianity and its primates during the same, by no means a brilliant period: their sometimes enforced or uncongenial, but still ever ready intervention in the affairs of the East, from the time when Pope Felix and Acacius issue their hostile interdicts, and Constantinople and Rome are at open war, more or less violent, during five and thirty years.

Between the pontificate of Felix III. and the rupture with Constantinople (it might ~~even~~ the implacable estrangement of the East and West) to the accession of Hormisdas, intervened three Popes, Gelasius I., Anastasius II., Symmachus.

Gelasius, a Roman, seemed, as a Roman, to assume the plenitude of Roman dignity. From the first, he adhered to all the lofty pretensions of his predecessor, and in his frequent and elaborate writings vindicated all the acts of Felix. He inexorably demanded, as the preliminary to any peaceful treaty, that the name of Acacius should be expunged from the diptychs. No power could now retrieve or rescue Acacius from his inevitable doom—Acacius, who had not only disregarded the excommunication of the Bishop of Rome, but pre-

Return to the
West

A.D. 484-519.

Gelasius I.
March 1, 492

sumed to emulate his power of pronouncing damnation. Constantinople must absolutely abandon the champion of her co-equality, if not her superiority. Acacius, all his followers, all who respect his memory, must share his irrevocable proscription.^a The Roman Gelasius endeavours to awaken a kindred pride in the Emperor Anastasius, now the sole representative of Roman sovereignty;^t for Italy is under the dominion of the Goth. Gelasius might even seem to cherish some secret hope of the deliverance of Rome from its barbaric lord, by the intervention of the yet Roman East. But at the same time Gelasius asserts boldly, for the first time, in these strong and discriminating terms, the supremacy of the clergy in all religious matters. "There are two powers which rule the world, the Imperial and the Pontifical. You are the sovereign of the human race, but you bow your neck to those who preside over things divine." The priesthood is the greater of the two

^a The letter of Gelasius to Euphemius of Constantinople is a model of that haughty humility which became the ordinary language of the Roman bishops. Euphemius had written, that by condescension and the best disposition Gelasius could restore concord ("annectis condescendibilem me et optimâ dispositione revocare posse concordiam").—"Do you call it condescension to admit among true bishops the names of heretics and excommunicated persons, and of those who communicate with them and their successors? Is not this, instead of descending like our Lord from heaven to redeem, to plunge ourselves into hell?" "Hoc non est condescendere ad subveniendum, sed evidentem in infernum demergi." He summons Eu-

phemius to meet him before the tribunal of Christ, in the presence of the apostles, and decide whether his austereness and asperity is not truly apostolic.—Epist. 1.

^t "Te sicut Romæ natus, Romanum principem, amo, colo, suscipio."—Ad Anastas., A.D. 493.

^u Gelasius refers to the authoritative example of Melchisedek, a type interpreted with curious variation during the Papal history. "In the oldest times Melchisedek was priest and king. The devil, in imitation of this holy example, induced the emperor to assume the supreme pontificate. But after Christianity had revealed the truth to the world, the union of the two powers ceased to be lawful. Neither did the emperor usurp the

powers; it has to render an account in the last day for the acts of kings." ^x

Pope Anastasius II., the successor of Gelasius, spoke a milder, more conciliatory, even more suppliant language. He dared to doubt the damnation of a bishop excommunicated by the see of Rome:—"Felix and Acacius are now both before a higher tribunal; leave them to that unerring judgment." ^y He would have the name of Acacius passed over in silence, quietly dropped, rather than publicly expunged from the diptychs. This degenerate successor of St. Peter is not admitted to the rank of a saint. The Pontifical book (its authority on this point is indignantly repudiated), accuses Anastasius of having communicated with a deacon of Thessalonica, who had kept up communion with Acacius; and of having entertained secret designs of restoring the name of

Pope Anastasius
Nov. 24, 496.

Nov. 19, 498.

pontifical, nor the pontiff the imperial power. Christ, mindful of human frailty, has separated for ever the two offices, leaving the emperors dependent on the pontiffs for their everlasting salvation, the pontiffs dependent on the emperors for the administration of all temporal affairs. So the ministers of God do not entangle themselves in secular business; secular men do not intrude into things divine." Pass over eight or nine centuries, and hear Innocent IV.; we give the pregnant Latin: "Dominus enim Iesus Christus . . . secundum ordinem Melchisedek, verus rex et verus sacerdos existens, quemadmodum patenter ostendit nunc utendo pro hominibus honorificentiam regis majestatis, nunc exequendo pro illius dignitatem pontifici apud Patrem, in apostolicâ sede non solum pontifi-

calem, sed et regalem constituit monarchatum, beato Petro ejusque successoribus tenendi simul et cœlestis imperii commissis habendis."—Apud Hoefler. Albert von Beham, p. 88. Stuttgart, 1847.

^x "Quando etiam pro ipsis regibus domino in divino reddituri sunt examine rationem."—Ad Anastas., Mansi, vii.

^y "Namque et predecessor noster Papa Felix, et etiam Acacius illic proculdubio sunt: ubi unusquisque sub tanto iudice non potest perdere sui meriti qualitatem."—Anastas. Epist. A.D. 496. This letter was sent to Constantinople by two bishops, Cresconius of Todi and Germanus of Capua, with private instructions, not recorded in history.

Acacius in the services of the Church.^a His death, according to Baronius, his sudden death by the manifest hand of God, destroyed altogether these hopes of peace. But how deep and lasting was the tradition of detestation against this meek renegade to papal authority may be supposed by its survival for at least nine centuries. Dante beholds in hell the unhappy Anastasius, condemned for ever for his leniency to the heresy of Constantinople.^a

On the death of Pope Anastasius, the contested election for the pontificate between Symmachus, a convert from paganism,^b and Laurentius, was exasperated by these divergences of opinion on the schism with the East. Festus, the legate of Anastasius, the deceased Pope, at Constantinople, the bearer, as it was supposed, of conciliatory terms obtained by the concessions of the Pope, on his return to Rome, threw himself as a violent partisan into the cause of Laurentius. The Emperor Anastasius himself, either in private letters to his adherents in Rome or in some public document, accused the successful Symmachus, who, by the decision of King Theodoric, had obtained the throne,^c as a Manichean; and as having audaciously conspired with the Senate of Rome (a singular Council for the Pope) to excommunicate the Emperor. The

^a "Revocare Acacium"—so I translate the words—as Acacius had long been dead.—Lib. Pontif., Vit. Anastas.

^b "E quivi per l'orribile soperchio
Del puzzo, che 'l profondo abisso gitta
Ci raccostammo dietro ad un coperchio
D'un grand'avello, ov'io vidi una scritta,
Che diceva Anastagio Papa guardo,
Lo qual trasse Fotino della via dritta."
Inf. xi 46

Fotinus is said to have been the Deacon of Thessalonica.

^b "Catholica fides, quam in sede beati Petri, veniens ex paganitate, suscepit."—Epiſt. ad Anastas. The date of this is uncertain. Was he a son or descendant of the famous Symmachus? The latter is more probable.

^c See on, under the reign of Theodoric, the elevation, struggle, and final establishment of Symmachus.

sovereign of the East inflexibly withheld the customary letters of gratulation on the accession of Symmachus. The apologetic invective of Symmachus to the Emperor is in the tone of fearless hostility. He retorts against the Eutychian the odious charge of Manicheism. He denies the excommunication of the Emperor Anastasius; Acacius only was excommunicated. Yet he leaves him to the inevitable conclusion that all who were in communion with the excommunicate must share their doom.^d Anastasius is arraigned as departing from his boasted neutrality only against the Catholics. The unyielding, almost turbulent resistance of the Roman party in Constantinople is justified by the aggressions assumed to be entirely on the part of the tyrannical Emperor. Peace between two such opponents was not likely to make much progress. Throughout the pontificate of Symmachus the Roman faction in the East kept up that fierce and tumultuous, or more secret and brooding opposition, which lasted till the death of Anastasius. Symmachus may have heard the first tidings of the orthodox revolt of Vitalianus; his successor Hormisdas reaped the fruits of the humiliation of Anastasius, followed in due time by the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches.*

^d Between 499-512. Baronius places it 503.

* See on, under the reign of Theodoric.

CHAPTER II.

Conversion of the Teutonic Races.

CHRISTIANITY within the Roman Empire might seem endangered in its vital existence by these ungenial inward dissensions. Its lofty assertions that it came down from heaven as a religion of peace—of peace to the individual heart of man, as reconciling it with God, and instilling the serene hope of another life—of peace which should incorporate mankind in one harmonious brotherhood, the type and pre-establishment of the sorrowless and strifeless state of beatitude—might appear utterly belied by the claims of conflicting doctrines on the belief, all declared to be essential to salvation, and the animosities and bloody quarrels which desolated Christian cities. Anathema instead of benediction had almost become the general language of the Church. Religious wars, at least rare in the pagan state of society, seemed now a new and perpetual source of human misery—a cause and a sign of the weakness and decay, and so of the inevitable dissolution, of the Roman Empire.

But Christianity had sunk into depths of the human heart, unmoved by these tumults, which so fiercely agitated the surface of the Christian world. Far below, less observed, less visible in its mode of operation, though manifest in its effects, was that profound conviction of the truth of the Gospel, that infelt sense of its blessings, which enabled it to pursue its course of

conversion throughout the world; to bring the Roman mind more completely under subjection, and one by one to subdue the barbarian tribes which began to over-spread and mingle with the Greek and Latin population of the Empire. For Christianity had that within it, which overawed, captivated, enthralled the innate or at least universal religiousness of mankind; that which was sufficiently simple to arrest by its grandeur the ~~under~~ barbarian, while, by its deeper mysteries, it led ~~on the~~ philosophic and reflective mind through unending regions of contemplation. It had its one Creator and Ruler of the universe, one God, one Redeemer, one Spirit, under which the ancient polytheism subsided into a subordinate hierarchy of intermediate beings, which kept the imagination in play, and left undisturbed almost all the hereditary superstitions of each race. It satisfied that yearning after the invisible, which seems inseparable from our nature; it nourished the fears and hopes which more or less vaguely have shadowed out some future being, the fears of retribution appeased by the promises of pardon, the hope of beatitude by its presentiments of peace. It had its exquisite goodness, which appealed to the indelible moral sense of mankind, to the best affections of his being; it had that equality as to religious privileges, duties, and advantages, to which it drew up all ranks and classes, and both sexes (slaves and females being alike with others under the divine care), and the abolition, so far, of the ordinary castes and divisions of men; with the substitution of the one distinction, the clergy and the laity, and perhaps also that of the ordinary Christian and the monk, who aspired to what was asserted and believed to be a higher Christianity. All this was, in various degrees, at once the manifest sign of its divinity, and the secret of its

gradual subjugation of nations at such different stages of civilisation. It prepared or found ready the belief in those miraculous powers, which it still constantly declared itself to possess; and made belief not merely prompt to accept, but creative of, wonder, and of perpetual preterhuman interference. Some special causes will appear, which seemed peculiarly to propitiate certain races towards Christianity, while their distinctive character reacted on their own Christianity, and through them perhaps on that of the world.

We are not at present advanced beyond the period when Christianity was in general content (this indeed gave it full occupation) to await the settle-

Conversion
of Germans
within the
Empire.

ment of the Northern tribes, if not within the pale, at least upon the frontiers of the Empire: it had not yet been emboldened to seek them out in their own native forests or morasses. But it was a surprising spectacle to behold the Teutonic nations melting gradually into the general mass of Christian worshippers. In every other respect they are still distinct races. The conquering Ostrogoth or Visigoth, the Vandal, the Burgundian, the Frank, stand, apart from the subjugated Roman population, as an armed or territorial aristocracy. They maintain, in great part at least, their laws, their language, their habits, their character; in religion alone they are blended into one society, constitute one church, worship at the same altar, and render allegiance to the same hierarchy. This is the single bond of their common humanity; and so long as the superior Roman civilisation enabled the Latins to retain exclusively the ecclesiastical functions, they might appear to have retreated from the civil power, which required more strenuous and robust hands to wield it, to this no less extensive

and important influence of opinion ; and thus held in suspense the trembling balance of authority. They were no longer the sovereigns and patricians, but they were still the pontiffs and priests in the new order of society.

There might appear in the Teutonic religious character a depth, seriousness, and tendency to the mysterious, congenial to Christianity, which would prepare them to receive the Gospel. The Grecian polytheist was often driven into Christianity by the utter void in his religion, and by the incongruity of its poetic anthropomorphism with the progress of his discursive reason, as well as by his weariness with his unsatisfactory and exhausted philosophy ; the Roman was commanded by its high moral tone and vigour of character. But each had to abandon temples, rites, diversions, literature, which had the strongest hold on his habits and character, and were so utterly incongruous with the primitive Gospel, that until Christianity made some steps towards the old religion by the splendour of its ceremonial, and the incipient paganising, not of its creed, but of its popular belief, there were powerful countervailing tendencies to keep him back from the new faith. And when the Greek entered into the Church, he was not content without exercising the quickness of his intelligence, and the versatilities of his language on his creed, without analysing, discussing, defining everything. Or by intruding that higher part of his philosophy, which best assimilated with Christianity, he either philosophised Christianity, or for a time, as under the Neo-Platonists and Julian, set up a partially Christianised philosophy as a new and rival religion. The inveterate corruption of Roman manners confined that vigorous Christian morality, its strongest commen-

dation to the Roman mind, at first within the chosen few who were not utterly abused by licentiousness or by servility: and even with them in large part it was obedience to civil authority, respect for established law, perhaps in many a kind of sympathy with the lofty and independent sacerdotal dignity, the sole representative of old Roman freedom, which contributed to Christianise the Latin world.

How much more suited were some parts of the Teutonic character to harmonise at first with Christianity, and to keep the proselytes in submission to the authority of its instructors in these sublime truths; at the same time to invigorate the Church by the infusion of its own strength and independence of thought and action, as well as to barbarise it with that ferocity which causes, is increased by, and maintains, the foreign conquests of ruder over more polished races! Teutonic religion. Already the German had the conception of an illimitable Deity, towards whom he looked with solemn and reverential awe. Tacitus might seem to speak the language of a Christian Father, almost of a Jewish prophet. Their gods could not be confined within walls, and it was degradation to these vast unseen powers to represent them under the human form. Reverential awe alone could contemplate that mysterious being which they called divinity.^a These deities, or this one Supreme, were shrouded in the untrodden, impenetrable forest. Such seems to have been the sublime conception above, if not anterior to, what may be called the mythology of Teutonic religion. This mythology was

^a "Cæterum non cohibere parietibus | nominibus appellant secretum illud
Deos, neque in ullam humani pris | quod solâ reverentiâ vident."—Tac.
speciem adsimilare ex magnitudine | German. ix.
cælestium arbitrantur, Deorumque |

the same, only in its elemental form, throughout the German tribes, with that which, having passed through more than one race of poets, grew into the Eddas of Scandinavia. Vestiges of this close relationship are traced in the language, in the mythic conceptions, and in the superstitions of all the Teutonic tribes. Certain religious forms and words are common to all the races of Teutonic descent.^b In every dialect appear kindred or derivative terms for the deity, for sacrifice, for temples, and for the priesthood. This mythic religion was in some points a nature-worship, though there might have existed, as has been said, something more ancient, and superior to the worship of the visible and impersonated powers or energies of the material world. The Romans discovered, not without wonder, that the supreme deity of the actual German worship was not invested in the attributes of their Jove, but rather of Mercury.^c

Woden.

There is no doubt that Woden was the divinity to whom they assigned this name, a name which, in its various forms (it became at length Odin), is common to the Goths, Lombards, Saxons, Frisians, and other tribes. In its primitive conception, if any of these conceptions were clear and distinct, Woden appears to have been the all-mighty, all-permeating Spirit—the Mind, the primal mover of things, the all-Wise, the God of speech and of knowledge.^d But with a warlike people, the

^b Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Einleitung, pp. 9-11 (2nd edit.). The whole large volume is a minute and laborious commentary on this axiom.

^c "Deum maximè Mercurium colunt."—Tac. *Ger.* ix.

^d "Wodan sanè quem adjectâ literâ Gwodan dixerunt, ipse est qui apud Romanos Mercurius dicitur, et ab

universis Germaniæ gentibus ut Deus adoratur."—Paul. Diacon. i. 9. See also Jonas Bobbiens. *Vit. Bonifac.* (Dies Mercurii became Woden's day, —Wednesday.) Compare Grimm, p. 116, Grimm, pp. 108, &c., and the whole article Wuotan, which he closes with the following observation :—
"Aber noch zu einen andern Betracht

supreme deity could not but be a god of battle, the giver of victory. He possessed therefore the attributes of Mars blended with those of Mercury.* The conduct or the reception of departed spirits, which belonged to the pagan Mercury, may have been one function which led to his identification with the Teutonic Woden. Already, no doubt, their world of the dead was a rude Valhalla.

In the earlier belief, the Thunderer, with the sun, the heavenly bodies, and the earth, the great objects of nature-worship, held only the second place. The Herthus of Tacitus was doubtless Hertha, the mother earth, or impersonated nature, of which he describes the worship in language singularly coincident with that of the Berecynthian goddess of Phrygia.†

tung darf die hohe stelle führen, welche die Germanen ihrem Wuotan anweisen. Der Monotheismus ist etwas so notwendiges und wesentliches, das fast alle Heiden in ihrer Gotte: bunten Gemimmel, bewusst oder unbewusst, darauf ausgehn, einen obersten Gott anzuerkennen, der schon die Eigenschaften aller übrigen in sich trägt, so dass diese nur als seine Einflüsse, verjüngenden und erfrischungen, zu betrachten sind. Daraus erklärt sich wie einzelne Eigenheiten bald einem bald diesem einzelnen Gott dargelegt werden, und warum die höchste Macht, nach Verschiedenheit der Völker auf den einen oder den andern derselben fällt."

* Paulus Diacon., loc. cit. He is called Sigvódr (Siegvald) in the Edda. —Grimm, p. 122.

† After recounting the tribes who worship this goddess, he proceeds:

"In commune Herthum, id est, Terram matrem colunt, eamque intervenire rebus hominum, inveni populis arbitrantur. Est in insulâ Oceanî castum nemus, dicatum in eo vehiculum, veste contextum, attingere uni sacerdoti concessum. Is adesse penetrali Deam intelligit, vectamque bobus feminis multa cum veneratione prosequitur. Lætâ tunc dies, festa loca, quæcunque adventu hospitioque dignatur. Non bella ineunt, non arma sumunt, clausum omne ferum; pax et quies tunc tantum nota, tunc tantum amata, donec idem sacerdos satiatam conversatione mortalium Deam templo reddat; mox vehiculum et vestes, et, si credere velis, numen ipsum secreto lacu abluntur. Servi ministrant, quos statim idem lacus haurit. Arcanus hinc terror, sanctæque ignorantia, quid sit illud quod tantum perituri vident." —Tacit. Germ. xl. Contrast and compare these secret and awful rites

There were other religious usages—most absolutely repugnant to Christianity, and demanding, as it were, her mild intervention,—so universal as to imply a closer relationship than that of unconnected races, which resemble each other from being in the same state of civilisation. From the borders of the Roman Empire to the shores of the Baltic, from the age of Tacitus to that of the Northern Chroniclers, human sacrifices appeased the gods, or rewarded them for the victories which they had bestowed upon their worshippers. The supreme god, Woden, the Mercury of Tacitus, was propitiated by human victims. The tribunes and principal centurions in the army of Varus were slain on these horrid altars.^g The Goths sacrificed their captives to the god of war.^h The Greek historian of the age of Justinian imputes the same ferocious usage to the Thuletes (the Scandinavians), and to the Heruli;ⁱ Sidonius Apollinarius to the Saxons.^k The Frisian law denounces not merely the penalty of death, but describes as an immolation to the gods the punishment of one who violates a temple. At a later period St. Boniface charges some of his Christian converts with the

(and their “truce of God”) with Lucretius,—

Quo nunc insigni per magnas prædita terras
Horridæ fertur divinae Matris imago . . .

Ergo cum primum magnas invecia per
urbes

Magnificat tacita mortales muta salute:

Ære atque argento sternunt iter omne viarum,

Largificæ stipe donantes, ninguntque rosarum

Floribus, umbrantes Matrem comitumque
catervas’—il. 597 *et seq*

(Also Ovid. *Fasti*, iv. 337.) Grimm, in another part of his book, illustrates all this by a circumstance related during the persecution of the Christian

Goths by Athanasius (Sozom. II. E. vi. 37). An image on a waggon was led in procession round the tents of the people; all who refused to worship and make their offerings to this Gothic deity were burned alive in their tents.

^g Tac. *Germ.* ix. and xxxix. Ann. i. 61. The Hermanduri and Catti are particularly mentioned as slaying human victims.

^h Jornandes, 86.

ⁱ Procop. de Bell. Gothic. ii. 14, ii. 15.

^k Epist. viii. 5.

sale of captives to the pagans for the purpose of sacrifice.^m At the great temple at Upsala every kind of animal was suspended in sacrifice: seventy-two dogs and men, mingled together, were counted on one occasion.ⁿ The northern poetry contains many vestiges of these human immolations. The Northmen are said by Dithmar of Merseburg to have sacrificed every year, about Christmas, ninety-nine men in a sacred place in Sea-land. This execrable custom was suppressed by the Emperor Henry I. the Fowler.^o

A. D. 926.

Among animals the horse was the chosen victim of all the Teutonic tribes. It was offered in the age of Tacitus in the German forests, which had been just penetrated by the Roman arms, and, according to the Sagas, by the yet unconverted Danes and Swedes.

Animal sacrifices.

Throughout the wide regions occupied by the Teutons the sacred grove was the sanctuary of the deity. The Romans could not tread without awe these dark dwelling places of the gods of their enemies; they were astonished at the absence of all images, and perhaps did not clearly distinguish the shapeless symbols which were set up in some places, from the aged trunks, which were also the objects of worship. The reverence for these hallowed places, the adoration of certain trees, survived the introduction of Christianity. The early missionaries and the local councils are full of denunciations against this inveterate heathen practice.

Holy groves.

^m "Quod quidem ex fidelibus ad immolandum paganis sua veniunt mancipia."—Epist. xxv.

ⁿ "Ita etiam canes, qui pendent cum hominibus, quorum corpora iuxta suspensa, narravit mihi quidam Christianorum se septuaginta duo vidisse."

^o Müller, *Saga Bibliothek*. ii. 560, v. 93. See also, in Mr. Thorpe's *Mythology of Scandinavia*, a copious list of references on the sanctity of groves, vol. i. p. 255 (note); on temples, p. 259 on human sacrifices, p. 264.

We shall behold St. Boniface and others, as their crowning triumph, daring to hew down stately trees, the objects of the veneration of ages, and the barbarians standing around, awaiting the event in sullen suspense, and leaving their gods, as it were, on this last trial. If they were gods, would they endure this contumelious sacrilege?

The belief in the immortality of the soul, and in another life, though not perhaps so distinct, or connected with the transmigration of the soul, as in Gaul, yet seems to have been universal, dominant; as far as warlike contempt of death, an active and influential faith. But it was to most men vague, dreary, dismal, —the Nifflheim, the home of clouds and darkness, was the common lot; the Valhalla that alone of the noble, and of select and distinguished warriors.

The priesthood were held in the same reverence throughout Germany. It was not an organised and powerful hierarchy, or a separate caste, like that of the Druids in Gaul and Britain;^p but the priests officiated in and presided over the sacred ceremonials of sacrifice and worship, and administered justice. In the early German wars, when Rome was, as it were, invading the sanctuaries of the Teutonic deities, the priesthood appear as a kind of officers of the god of war, enforcing discipline, branding cowardice, and inflicting punishment, which the free German spirit would endure only from those who bore a divine commission.^q

^p Cæsar says of the Germans, with the hierarchy of Gaul.—“Un-
 “Neque Druides habent qui rebus gleich beträchtlicher war in Zahl und
 divinis præsent, neque sacrificis student.”—B. G. vi. 21. This, though
 Ausbildung das celtische Priesterthum.”
 not strictly true, is true in the sense —Crimm.
 in which Cæsar wrote, as contrasted ^q “Cæterum neque animadvertere,
 neque vincere, nec verberare quidem,

In all affairs of public concern—the priest; in private affairs—the head of the family, interpreted the lots by which the gods rendered their oracles.^r The priest or the king might alone harness the sacred horses; the allusions to the priesthood in the late writers on the various conquering tribes, are not very frequent, but sufficient to show that they had that veneration inseparable from the character of persons who performed sacrifices, consulted the gods, and by auspices, or other modes of divination, predicted victory or disaster.^s Prophetic women characterise the Teutonic faith in all its numerous branches. The Velleda of Tacitus, who ruled like a queen, and was worshipped almost as a goddess, is the ancestress of the Nornas of the poetic Sagas.^t In the East the gift of prophecy is sometimes, but rarely, vouchsafed to females; in Greece it was equally shared by both sexes; the seer or prophet is the exception in the Northern mythology. This reverence for women, especially for sacred virgins, no doubt prepared them to receive one article of the new religious faith, which had already begun to grow towards its later all-absorbing importance; while it harmonised with the

nisi sacerdotibus permissum; non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis ju-su, sed velut Deo imperante, quem adesse bellantibus credunt.”—Tacit. Germ. vii.

^r Tac. Germ. x. and xi. A priest of the Catti was led in the triumph of Germanicus.—Strabo.

^s Even Grimm’s industry is baffled by the question of the power of the priesthood in Germany: “Aus der folgenden zeit und bis zur einföhrung des Christenthüms, haben wir fast gar keine künde weiter wie es sich in

innern Deutschland mit den priestern verhielt; ihr dasein folgt aus dem der tempel und offer.”—p. 61. Among the Anglo-Saxons the priests might not bear arms, or ride, except on a mare.—Bede, Hist. Ecc. ii. 13.

^t Tac. Germ. viii. Hist. iv. 61. “Ea virgo, nationis Bructeræ, latè imperitabat. Vetere apud Germanos more, quo plerasque fœminarum fatidicas, et augescente superstitione, arbitrantur Deas.” Compare iv. 65, v. 24, Grimm, Art. Weise Frauen. .

general tendency of Christian doctrine to elevate the female sex.

Such was the general character of the Teutonic religion, disposed to the dark, the awful, the mysterious, with a profound belief in prophetic revelations, and a Teutons encounter Christianity. priesthood accustomed to act in a judicial, as well as in a religious capacity. And with such religious conceptions, and habits of thought and feeling, the Northern tribes, first on the frontiers, afterwards within the frontiers, and gradually in the heart of the Roman Empire, came into the presence of Christianity—of Christianity now organised under a powerful priesthood, a hierarchy of bishops, priests, and inferior clergy: laying claim to divine inspiration; and though that divine inspiration was gathered and concentrated as it were, into a sacred book—in a wider and more vague and indistinct sense, it remained with the rulers of the Church. The Teutonic conqueror, already expatriated by the thirst for conquest or the aggression of more martial tribes, by his migration had broken off all local associations of sanctity; he had left far behind him his hallowed grove," and his reeking altar;* even the awe of his primeval forests must have gradually worn away as he advanced into the southern sunshine and took possession of the regular towns or the cultivated farms of his Roman subjects.

The human sacrifices not merely belonged of ancient usage to these gloomy sanctuaries; but even before they had learned the Christian tenet, that all sacrifice had

* The Lombards even in Italy found stately trees to worship. See Muratori, Dissert. 59, especially a curious quotation about a holy tree in the dukedom of Benevento. The Gallic Councils

(Arles, 452; Tars, 597; Nantes, 658) prohibit the worship of trees, the latter of certain stones.

* Luitprand. Leg. l. vi. 30.

ceased with the one great sacrifice on the cross, the milder manners, which they could not but inevitably, if slowly, acquire by intercourse with more polished nations, would render such dire offerings more and more unfrequent: they would be reserved for signal occasions till at length they would fall into total desuetude.

In one respect, in which the genius of Christianity might have been expected to clash with his own religious notions, Christianity had already advanced many steps to meet the Teuton. The Christian God, and even the gentle Saviour of mankind, had become a God of battle. Christ a God of battle. The cross, the symbol of Christian redemption, glittered on the standards of the legions; and every victory, and every new conquest, might encourage the hope that this God, the God of the southern people, did not behold them with disfavour, was deserting his own votaries, and would gladly receive and reward the allegiance of more manly and valiant worshippers. Notwithstanding the proud consciousness of their own superior prowess as warriors, the Teutonic conquerors could not enter into the dominions of Rome, cross the Roman bridges, march along the Roman roads, encamp before the walled cities, with their towers, temples, basilicas, forums, aqueducts, baths, and churches now aspiring to grandeur if not magnificence, without awe at the superior intellectual power of those whom they had subdued. It was natural to connect this intellectual superiority with the religion; and while everything else, the civil power, the ordinary administration of affairs, as well as the army, bowed before them, the religion alone stood up, resolute, unyielding, almost undisturbed. Respect for the clergy The Christian bishops and clergy (like the aged senators of old, as they are described in the noble passage of Livy, awaiting their

doom in the Capitol, and appalling for a time the ruthless Gaul by the venerable majesty of their dress and demeanour) might seem to awe their conquerors into respect; and though at times, when the paroxysm of wonder was broken, as in the former instance, the conquerors might insult or even massacre the objects of their adoration, still in general the sacred character would work on the superstitious mind of the barbarian. The Teuton had already the habit of contemplating the priest as the representative of divinity. According to the general feeling of polytheism, acknowledging the gods of other tribes or nations, as well as his own, to possess divine power, he arrayed the priesthood of the stranger in the same fearfulness; the mysterious sanctity which dwelt with the Christian's God hallowed the Christian bishop.

Nor, though individual priests might and did accom-
 No Teutonic
 priesthood. pany the migratory tribes, does there appear any of that strong sacerdotal spirit which belongs to an organised hierarchy, by which its influence is chiefly maintained and established; which is pledged to and supported by mutual emulation, and by fear of the reproach of treason to the common cause, or of base abandonment of the wealth, the power, and the credit of the fraternity. With these elements then of faith within his heart, the German was migrating into the territory as it were of a new God, and was encountered everywhere by the priest of that God. That priest was usually full of zeal, and, with all to whom his language was intelligible, of eloquence; confessedly in all intellectual qualities a superior being, and asserting himself to be divinely commissioned to impart the truth; seizing every opportunity of vicissitude, of distress, of sickness, of affliction, to enforce the power and goodness of his

God ; himself perhaps in perfect faith turning every one of those countless incidents, which to a barbarian mind was capable of a supernatural tinge, into a manifest miracle ; opening a new and more distinct and terrible hell and a heaven of light and gladness, and declaring himself to possess the keys of both.

At no time, under no circumstances, would Christianity appear more sincere, more devout, ^{Effect on} more commanding, or more amiable. As has ^{Christians.} always been observed during a plague, an earthquake, or any other great public calamity, men become either more recklessly godless, or more profoundly religious ; so during the centuries of danger, disaster and degradation, which were those of barbarian invasion and conquest, the fire must, as it were, have been trying the spirits of men. Those who had no vital or rooted religion would fall off, as some of them would assert, from a God who showed them no protection. These while free would waste away the few remaining years or days of their wealth, or at all events of their freedom, in licentiousness and luxury ; if slaves they would sink to all the vices, as well as the degradation of slavery. The truly religious, on the other hand, would clasp more nearly to their heart the one remaining principle of consolation and of dignity. They would fly from a world which only offered shame and misery, to the hope of a better and more happy state of being. Death was their only release, but beyond death, they were secure, they were at peace ; they would take refuge, at least in faith, from the face of a tyrannical master, or what to a free-born Roman was as galling and humiliating, a lord and proprietor, in the presence of the Redeemer. They would flee from down-trodden servitude on earth to glory and beatitude in heaven. The darker the

calamity, the more entire the resignation: as wretchedness would be more rampant, so devotion would be more devout. The Provincial with his home desolated, his estate seized, his family outraged or massacred or carried away into bondage, would, if really Christian, consider himself as taking up his cross; he would be a more fervent, as it were, a desperate believer. In the letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, we find the Bishop of Clermont writing to Maternus, the Bishop of Vienne, for the form of certain litanies or rogations, which were used in that city during an earthquake and conflagration: he proposes to institute the same solemn ceremonies in apprehension of the invasion of the Goths into Auvergne. Salvian bitterly reproaches the Roman Gauls with their passion for theatric games, which they indulged during such days of peril and disaster only with more desperate intensity. But, even if the true Christians in those hours of trial were fewer in number, it cannot be doubted that their piety took a more vehement and impassioned character. It was the time for great Christian virtues, as well as for more profound Christian consolations, virtues which in some points would be strikingly congenial to barbaric minds, as giving a sublime patience and serenity in suffering, a calm contempt of death. The Germans would admire the martyr whom in their wantonness they slew, if that martyr showed true Christian tranquillity in his agony. There was no danger which the better bishops and clergy would not encounter for their flocks; they would venture to confront unarmed the fierce warrior; all the treasures of the unplundered churches were willingly surrendered for the redemption of captives. The austerities practised by some of the clergy, and by those who had commenced the monastic life, would arrest

the attention and enthrall the admiration of barbarians, to whom self-command, endurance, strength of will, would appear kindred and noble qualities. In the early period, when the Germans still dwelt separate in their camps, or in the ceded settlements within the frontier,* the captives would be, and as history shows, were the chief missionaries. The barbarians on the one hand would more and more feel the intellectual superiority of their bond-slaves, which would induce them to look favourably on their religion. The captives, some of them bishops, some females of high rank and influential beauty, where they were truly Christians, would be urged by many of the purest, and many less holy motives, to convert their masters. The sacred duty of disseminating the Gospel, the principle of love which would impart its blessings to all mankind; the strong conviction that they were rescuing the barbarians from ~~eternal~~ damnation, the doom of all but the believers in Christ; and so in the noblest form the returning good for evil, would conspire with the pride and consolation of ruling their rulers; of maintaining in one sense the Roman supremacy over the minds of men. The end would sanctify all arts, dignify all humiliations; Christian zeal and worldly ambition would act together in perfect harmony.

Where the Teutonic nations had penetrated more into the midst of the Roman empire; where they had settled down, as they did successively, in all the provinces, as lords of the soil, they would be more fully in the presence and concentrated influence of Christianity. Themselves without temples, without shrines, without altars, perhaps without a priesthood, they would be daily spectators of the lofty and spacious edifices, perhaps the imposing processions, the ceremonial, which had already begun to assume some

Teutons in
the midst of
the Empire.

grandeur, of the Christian churches. If admitted, or forcing their way within, or hearing from without the hymns and the music, the ordinary ceremonial which they would witness, and still more perhaps the more solemn mysteries which were jealously shrouded from their sight would lay hold upon their unpreoccupied religiousness, and offer them as almost ready captives to the persuasive teacher of these new and majestic truths. Their conversion therefore was more speedy, and comparatively more complete. They too contributed much to establish that imposing, but certainly degenerate form of warlike and sacerdotal Christianity, which had been growing up for two or three centuries. No doubt they retained and infused into the Christianity of the conquered provinces many of their old native superstitions and modes of religious thought and feeling, but far less than survived in Germany itself. There the nature-worship lingered behind in the bosom of Christianity; and under the sublime Monotheism of Christianity, the old beneficent or malignant deities of paganism, became angels or spirits of evil. Everywhere among the converted tribes, the groves, the fountains, the holy animals, preserved their sanctity. As we accompany the missionaries in their spiritual campaigns we shall encounter many curious circumstances, which will appear more striking when in their proper position, than brought together and crowded in one general view. The character of the Christianity which grew up out of these discordant elements will be best discerned in the progress of its growth.⁷

⁷ The description of the Holstemians *nomen tantum Christianitatis habetis* by Helmold (i. 47) will apply more . . . *nam lucorum et fontium cætera* or less to most of the early German *rumque superstitionum multo ex error* converts; "*Nihil de religione nisi apud vos habetur.*"

About the year 300 Christianity had found its way among the Goths and some of the German tribes on the Rhine. The Visigoths first embraced the Gospel, as a nation; they were followed by the Ostrogoths; with these the Vandals and the Gepidæ were converted during the fourth century. At the close of the fifth century the Franks were converted, and at the beginning of the sixth, first the Alemanni, then the Lombards; the Bavarians in the seventh and eighth, the Frisians, Hessians, and Thuringians in the eighth; the Saxons by the sword of Charlemagne in the ninth. Our present inquiry limits itself to the conversions within the pale of the Roman Empire, and closes with that of the Franks. With the exception of the latter, the whole of these nations were the conquests of Arian Christianity, or embraced it during the early period of their belief. That diversity of religious creed which perplexed the more mature Christians, especially the disputatious Greek and imaginative Asiatic, touched not these simple believers. The Arian Goth had submissively received the lessons of his first teacher, and with some tribes the difference was so little felt, that he did not persecute on account of it. Nations changed their belief with but slight reluctance. The Burgundians in Gaul were first Catholic, then Arian under the Visigothic rule, Catholic again with the Franks. The Suevians in Spain were first Catholic, then fell off into Arianism: it was not till the sixth century that Spain was Catholic. For soon, indeed, religious difference became a pretext for cruelty and ambition, made the Vandal in Africa a persecutor as well as a tyrant, and became the battle word of the Frank when he would invade the dominions of the Burgundian or the Visigoth, or when he de-

Successive
conversion of
Teutonic
tribes.

Arianism of
first converts.

scended into Italy to protect the orthodox Bishop of Rome against the heterodox Lombard.

But of these early Arian missionaries, the Arian records, if they ever existed, have almost entirely perished. The Church was either ignorant of or disdained to preserve their memory. ^{Ulphilas.} Ulphilas alone, the apostle of the Goths, has, as it were, forced his way into the Catholic records, in which, as in the fragments of his great work, his translation of the Scriptures into the Mœso-Gothic language, this admirable man has descended to posterity.^z Ulphilas was a Goth by birth, not by descent. His ancestors, during a predatory expedition of the Goths into Asia, under the reign of Gallienus, had been swept away with many other captives, some belonging to the clergy, from a village in Cappadocia, to the Gothic settlements north of the Danube.^a These captives, faithful to their creed, perpetuated and propagated among their masters the doctrines of Christianity. Ulphilas first appears as the Bishop of the Goths, and as their ambassador at the Court of Valens.^b His religion, and his descent from a Roman provincial family, as well as high influence, might designate him for this mission to the Roman Emperor of the East.^c The Goths beyond the Danube,

^a The orthodox abbreviator of Philostorgius acknowledges, but carefully suppresses, the praises which Philostorgius had lavished on Ulphilas. We would almost have forgiven him the suppression of the praise, if he had imparted the more extensive information which Philostorgius seems to have preserved of this great event.

^a The name of Futyches, called by S. Basil, the Blessed, has survived, as having from the same region, Cap-

padocia, established a church among the Scythians (the Sarmatians), who had been subdued, and were mingled with the Goths. S. Cyril asserts that the Scythians had no cause to envy the Empire; they had their bishops, priests, deacons, sacred virgins.—Cyril Hierosolym. Catech. xvi.

^b Basil, Epist. 16, tome iii.

^c It is said that the Gothic bishop, like his predecessor Theophilus, reported to have been present at the

pressed by the more powerful and ferocious Huns, requested permission to cross the Danube, and settle in Mœsia, within the Roman frontier. Among the motives which induced the Emperor to consent, and to accept this nation of hardy but dangerous subjects was their, at least partial, conversion to Christianity. Ulphilas was called by the grateful Christian Goths, who might now pasture their herds in the rich plains of Thrace, the Moses, who had led them into the land of promise.^d But the disciples of Ulphilas formed but a small part of the vast migration, which, partly under permission, partly by bribery of the Imperial officers, partly by stealth, and partly by force, came swarming over the river, and took possession of the unprotected Roman province. The heathen part of the population brought over their own priests and priestesses, with their altars and rites; but on those mysterious rites they maintained an impenetrable silence; they disguised their priests in the garb and manners of Christian bishops. They had even fictitious monks clothed in black, and demeaning themselves as

Migration of
Goths across
the Danube.

Council of Nicæa (Socrates, ii. 41), had professed that creed; that he was threatened, bribed, persuaded by Valens to accede to his Arianism, and acquiesced in it as a mere verbal dispute. οὐκ εἶναι δογμάτων ἑφθ διαφοράν, ἀλλὰ ματαίαν ἔριν ἐργάσασθαι τὴν διδασκασιν.—Theodoret, iv. 37. But see the very curious character and creed of Ulphilas, in the speech of his disciple Bishop Auxentius at the Council of Aquileia (A.D. 381), reported by Bishop Maximinus. This remarkable fragment was edited by Dr. Waitz from a MS. in Paris. Über das Leben

und die Lehre des Ulfila. von George Waitz. Hannover, 1840. Also the Preface to the new and excellent Edition of the Bible of Ulphilas, by the very learned H. F. Massmann. Stuttgart, 1856. Compare Hist. of Christianity, book iii., close of chap. vii.

^d Philostorg. ii. 5. Auxentius (apud Waitz, p. 20) uses the same comparison to Moses and the Red Sea (the Danube), and adds, “eo populo in solo Romanis ubi sine illis septem annis triginta et tribus annis veritatem prædicavit, &c.”—and so makes up the forty years of Moses.

Christian ascetics.^e Thus, relates the heathen historian, who makes this curious statement, while they faithfully but secretly adhered to their own religion, the Romans were weak enough to suppose them perfect Christians. But once on the Roman side of the Danube, the more martial Goths spurned the religion which they had condescended to feign with barbarian cunning.^f Ulphilas, as a true missionary of the Prince of Peace, aspired not merely to convert his disciples to Christianity, but to peaceful habits. In his translation of the Scriptures he left out the Books of Kings, as too congenial and too stimulative to their warlike propensities.^g The Goths divided into two factions, each with its great hereditary chieftain: of the one, the valiant Athanaric; of the other Fritigern, the friend of Ulphilas. The warlike and anti-Christian party appealed to their native Gods, and raised a violent persecution.^h The God of their fathers was placed on a lofty wagggon and drawn through the whole camp; all who refused their adoration were burned, with their whole families, in

Strife among
the Goths.

* This remarkable passage of Eunapius is one of the most important historical fragments discovered in the Palimpsest MSS. by Monsignor Mai. It was of course unknown to the older historians, including Gibbon.—Mai, p. 277. In the reprint of the Byzantines (Bonn, 1829, edit. Niebuhr), p. 82, Eunapius speaks of the false bishops having much of the fox. The hatred of Eunapius to the monks breaks out in his description of these impostors. “The mimicry of the monks was not difficult; it was enough to sweep the ground with black robes and tunics, to be good for nothing and believed in.” οὐδὲν ἐχούσης τῆς

μιμήσεως πραγμάτων καὶ δύσκολον, ἀλλὰ ἐξήρκει φαῖδ ἱμάτια σύρουσι καὶ χιτῶνια, πονηροῖς τε εἶναι καὶ πιστεύεσθαι.

^f Are we to attribute Jerome's triumphant exclamations to these events? Probably not altogether. “Getarum rutilus et flavus exercitus, Ecclesiarum cunctumfert tentoria.”—Ad Lat. “Stridorem suum in dulce crucis fregerunt melos.”—Ad Hebod. “Hunni discunt Psalterium.”—Ad Lat.

^g Philostorgius, loc. cit.

^h These persecutions are by some placed before the migration over the Danube. I think the balance of probability favours the view in the text.

their tents. A multitude, especially of helpless women and children, who took refuge in their rude church, were likewise mercilessly burned with their sacred edifice.¹ But while in their two great divisions, the Ostrogoths and Visigoths, the nation, gathering its descendants from all quarters, spread their more or less rapid conquests over Gaul, Italy, and Spain, Ulphilas formed a peaceful and populous colony of shepherds and herdsmen on the pastures below Mount Hæmus.^k He became the Primate of a simple Christian nation. For them he formed an alphabet of twenty-four letters, and completed (all but the fierce Books of Kings) his translation of the Scriptures. Thus the first Teutonic Christians received the gift of the Bible, in their own language, from the Apostle of their race.^m

No record whatever, not even a legend remains, of the manner in which the two great branches of the Gothic race, the Visigoths in France and the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, the Suevians in Spain, the Gepidæ, the Vandals, the mingled hosts which formed the army of Odoacer, the first king of Italy, and at length the fierce Lombards, were converted to Christianity.ⁿ They no doubt yielded—but secretly

¹ Sozomen, iv. 37. Compare the legend of S. Saba. apud Bolland, April 12—remembering that it is a legend.

^k “Gothi minores, populus immensus cum suo Pontifice ipsoque Primate Wulfila . . . ad pedes montis. Gens multa sedit, pauper et imbellis, nisi armento diversi generis pecorum et pascuis, silvæque lignorum, parum habens tritici.”—Jornandes, c. lii.

^m It is difficult to discriminate between the rhetoric and the facts recorded by Jerome. If we are to

take his words in their plain sense, theologic studies were far advanced among the Goths: “Quis hoc crederet ut barbara Getarum lingua Hebraicam quæreretur veritatem? et dormitantibus imo contententibus Græcis, ipsa Germania Spiritus Sancti eloquia scutaretur.”—Epist. ad Juniam et Fretulam, tom. ii. p. 626

ⁿ Idacius (Chron. 448) says the Suevians were first Catholic; if so, they were converted to Arianism by the Goths.

and imperceptibly—to those influences described above; the faith appears to steal from nation to nation, and wins king after king; and it is only when they become sovereigns of great independent kingdoms, conquerors like Alaric, founders of dynasties like Theodoric in Italy, and the Visigothic and Suevian monarchs in France and Spain, or raise fierce persecutions, like the Vandals in Africa against the Catholics, that we recognise them as professed Christians, and Christians holding a peculiar form of faith.*

Of the Burgundians alone, and the motives of their conversion, remains a curious detail in one of the Byzantine ecclesiastical historians. The Burgundians occupied at that time the left bank of the Rhone, had acquired peaceful habits, and employed themselves in some kind of manufacture.^p The terrible invasion of the Huns broke in upon their quiet industry. Despairing of the aid of man, they looked round for some protecting Deity; the God of the Romans appeared the mightiest, as worshipped by the most powerful people. They set off to a neighbouring city of Gaul, requested, and after some previous fasting, received baptism from the bishop. Their confidence in their new tutelar Deity gave them courage, they discomfited with a small body of troops, about 3000, a vast body of the Huns, who lost 10,000 men. From that time the Burgundians embraced Christianity, in the words of the historian, with fiery zeal.^q

* Compare a modern book of research and judgement, and on the whole, of candour, L'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques, par Ch. J. Reveillot. Paris: Besançon, 1850.

^p Socrates, Ecc. Hist. vii. 30. οὗτοι γὰρ σχεδὸν πάντες εἰσὶν. Of what were they artisans? This was during the reign of Theodosius II., A.D. 408-449. ^q τὸ ἔθνος διαπύρως ἐχριστιάνισεν, loc. cit.
 θίον ἀπαράγμωνα (ῶσιν ἄελ, τέκτορες

But all these nations were converts to the Arian form of Christianity, except perhaps the Burgundians,^{*} who under the Visigoths fell off to ^{All Arians.} Arianism. Ulphilas himself was a semi-Arian, and acceded to the creed of Rimini. Hence the total silence of the Catholic historians, who perhaps destroyed, or disdained to preserve the name of Arian conquests to the common Christianity.[†] The first conversion of a Teutonic nation to the faith, of which any long and particular account survives, was that of the Franks, and that by Catholic prelates into stern proselytes to the Catholic faith.[‡]

This conversion of the Franks was the most important event in its remote as well as its immediate consequences in European history. ^{Conversion of Franks.} It had great influence on the formation of the Frankish monarchy. The adoption of the Catholic form of faith, by arraying on the side of the Franks all the Catholic prelates and their followers, led to their preponderance over the Visigothic and Burgundian kings, to their descent into Italy under Pepin and his son, and to their intimate connexion with the Papal see; and thus paved the way for the Western Empire of Charlemagne. They were the chosen champions of Catholicism, and Catholicism amply repaid them by vindicating all their aggressions upon the neighbouring kingdoms, and aiding in every way the consolidation of their formidable power. The Franks, the most barbarous of the Teu-

^{*} Orosius, vii. 22.

orthodox.—De Gubern. Dei.

[†] Salvian is absolutely charitable to the errors of the German Arians: "Hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes. Errant ergo, sed bono animo errant, non odio sed affectu Dei." But this is to contrast them with the vices of the

[‡] Gregory of Tours is the great authority for this period: he wrote for those "qui appropinquante mundi fine desperant."—In *Prolog.* See Loebel, Gregor von Tours; Ampère. *Hist. Lit. de la France.*

tonic tri^{es} (though in cruelty they seem to have been surpassed by the Vandals), had settled in a Christian country, already illustrious in legendary annals for the wonders of Saints, as of Martin of Tours, the foundation of monasteries, and the virtues of Bishops like Remigius, who ruled over the great cathedral city of Rheims.

The south of France was ruled by Arian sovereigns. Clovis was a pagan, then only the chief of about 4000 Frankish warriors, but full of adventurous daring and unmeasured ambition. His conversion, if it had not issued in events of such profound importance to mankind, might have seemed but a trivial and fortuitous occurrence. The influence of a female conspires with the conviction that the Christians' God is the stronger God of battle; such are the impulses which seem to bring this bold yet crafty barbarian, who no doubt saw his advantage in his change of belief, to the foot of the Cross, and made him a strenuous assertor of orthodox faith. Clovis had obtained in marriage the niece of Gundebald, king of the Burgundians. The early life of this Princess was passed amid the massacre of her parents and kindred; it shows how little Christianity had allayed the ferocity of these barbarians.

Gundicar, king of the Burgundians, left four sons. The fate of the family was more like that of a polygamous Eastern prince, where the sons of different mothers, bred up without brotherly intercourse in the seraglio, own no proximity of blood. Gundebald, the elder son, first slew his brother Chilperic, tied a stone round the neck of Chilperic's wife, and cast her into the Rhone, beheaded his two sons, and threw their bodies into a well. The daughters, of whom Clotilda was one, he preserved alive. Godemar, his next brother, he besieged in his castle, set it on fire, and burned him

Gundicar the
Burgundian.

alive. Godesil, the third brother, as will be related at a subsequent period, shared the same fate. Gundebald as yet only a double fratricide, either felt, or thought it right to appear to feel, deep remorse for his crimes. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, saw or imagined some inclination in the repentant king to embrace Catholicism. In a far different language from that spoken by Ambrose to the Emperor Theodosius, the Bishop addressed the bloody monarch,—“You weep with inexpressible grief at the death of your brothers, your sympathising people are afflicted by your sadness. But by the secret counsels of God, this sorrow shall turn to joy; no doubt this diminution in the number of its princes was intended for the welfare of the kingdom, those alone were allowed to survive who are needed for the administration of the kingdom.”

Gundebald, however, resisted these flattering arguments, and remained obstinately Arian; but Clotilda, his niece, it is unknown through what influence, was educated in orthodoxy. Clotilda took the opportunity, when the heart of her husband Clovis might be softened by the birth of her first-born son, to endeavour to wean him from his idolatry. Clovis listened with careless indifference; yet with the same indifference common in the Teutonic tribes, permitted the baptism of the infant. But the child died, and Clovis saw in his death the resentment of his offended Gods; he took but little comfort from the assurance of the submissive mother, that her son, having been baptized, was in the presence of God. Yet with the same strange versatility of feeling, he allowed his second son also to be baptized. This child too declined, and Clovis began to renew his re-

proach¹¹⁷; but the prayer of the mother was heard, and the child restored to health.*

It was not, however, in this gentler character that the Frank would own the power of the Christian's God. The Franks and the Alemanni met in battle at Tolbiac, not far from Cologne. The Franks were worsted, when Clovis bethought him of Clotilda's God. He cast off his own inefficient divinities; he prayed to Christ, and made a solemn vow, that if he were succoured, he would be baptized as a Christian.^y The tide of battle turned; the king of the Alemanni was slain; and the Alemanni, in danger of total destruction, hailed Clovis as their sovereign.

Clotilda, without loss of time, sent the glad tidings to Remigius, Bishop of the city of Rheims. Clovis still hesitated, till he could consult his people. The obsequious warriors declared their readiness to be of the same religion as their king. To impress the minds of the barbarians the baptismal ceremony was performed with the utmost pomp; the church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains; odours of incense like airs of Paradise were diffused around; the building blazed with countless lights. When the new Constantine knelt in the font to be cleansed from the leprosy of his heathenism, "Fierce Sicambrian," said the Bishop, "bow thy neck: burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou hast burned!"

* According to Gregory of Tours, she argued with her husband against the worship of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury. Was it ignorance, or did Gregory suppose that he was writing like a Roman? — Gregor. Turon. ii.

y "Invocavi enim Deos meos, sed, ut experior, elongati sunt ab auxilio meo, unde credo eos nullius esse potestatis præditos, qui sibi obedientibus non succurrunt. Te nunc invoco, et tibi credens desidero, tantum ut eruar ab adversariis meis." — Greg. Turon. ii. 30.

Three thousand Franks followed the example of Clovis. During one of their subsequent religious conferences, the Bishop dwelt on the barbarity of the Jews in the death of the Lord. Clovis was moved, but not to tenderness,—“Had I and my faithful Franks been there, they had not dared to do it.” A.D. 496.

At that time Clovis the Frank was the only orthodox sovereign in Christendom. The Emperor Anastasius lay at least under the suspicion of favouring the Eutychian heresy. The Ostrogoth Theodoric in Italy, the Visigothic² and Burgundian kings in France, the Suevian in Spain, the Vandal in Africa were Arians. If unscrupulous ambition, undaunted valour and enterprise, and desolating warfare, had been legitimate means for the propagation of pure Christianity, it could not have found a better champion than Clovis. For the first time the diffusion of belief in the nature of the Godhead became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighbouring territory.⁴ Already the famous Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, has addressed a letter to Clovis, in which he augurs from the faith of Clovis the victory of the Catholic faith; even the heterodox Byzantine emperor is to tremble on his throne; Catholic Greece to exult at the dawning of this new light in the West. The wars of Clovis with Burgundy were all but

² Euric, the greatest of the Visigothic kings, was now dead; he had left but feeble successors. Euric laboured under the evil fame of a persecutor; he had attempted what Theodoric aspired to effect in Italy, but with far less success, the fusion of the two races—the Roman and Teutonic; but that of which Sidonius so bitterly complains, of so many sees

vacant by the intolerance of Euric, the want of bishops and clergy to perpetuate the Catholic succession, ruined churches, and grass-grown altars, reads as too eloquent. Reveillot admits that the views of Euric were political rather than religious (p. 141).

⁴ The rebellion of Vitabanus in the East was a few years later.

openly declared wars of religion; the orthodox clergy hardly condescended to disguise their inclination to the Franks, whom they supported with their prayers, if not with more substantial assistance.^b Before the war broke out, a synod of the orthodox Bishops met, it is said, under the advice of Remigius, at Lyons. With Avitus at their head, they visited King Gundebald, and proposed a conference with the Arian bishops, whom they were prepared to prove from the Scripture to be in error.^c The king shrewdly replied,—“If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the King of the Franks from waging an unjust war, and from caballing with my enemies against me?”^d There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works.” Avitus skilfully eluded this question, and significantly replied, that he was ignorant of the motives of Clovis, “but ~~as I know, that God~~ overthrows the thrones of those who are disobedient to

^b The barbarous Clovis must have heard, it must not be said, read, still less, considering the obscure style of the prelate, understood, the somewhat gross and lavish flattery of his faith, his humility, even his *mercy*, to which the saintly Bishop scrupled not to condescend: “*Vestra fides nostra victoria est. . . . Gaudeat ergo quidem Græcia se habere principem legis nostræ. Numquid fidem perfectio prædicabimus quam ante perfectionem sine prædicatore vidistis? an forte humilitatem . . . an misericordiam quam solutus a vobis adhuc nuper populus captivus gaudis mundo insinuat lacrymis Deo?*” The mercy of Clovis!—Avitus, Epist. xli.

^c It is remarkable that all the dis-

tinguished and influential of the clergy appear on the Catholic side. The Arians are unknown even by name. It is true that we have only Catholic annalists. But I have little doubt that the Arian prelates were for the most part barbarians, inferior in education and in that authority which still, in peaceful functions, attached to the Roman name. It was Rome now enlisting a new clan of barbarians in her own cause, and under her own guidance, against her foreign oppressors.

^d The Bishop Avitus of Vienne was in correspondence with the insurgent Vitalianus in the court of the Emperor Anastasius. So completely were now all wars and rebellions religious wars.

his law.”^e When after the submission of the Burgundian kingdom to the payment of tribute to the Franks, Gundebald resumed the sway, his first act was to besiege his brother Godesil, the ally of Clovis, in Vienne. Godesil fled to the Arian church, and was slain there with the Arian Bishop.^f On this occasion Avitas tried again to work on the obstinate mind of Gundebald; his arguments confounded, but did not persuade the king, who retained his errors to the end of his life.

When, however, Clovis determined to attack the kingdom of the Visigoths, the monkish historian ascribes to him this language:—“I am ^{Religious wars} sore troubled that these Arians still possess so large a part of Gaul.”^g Before he set out on his campaign, the King of the Franks went to perform his devotions before the shrine of St. Martin at Tours. As he entered the church he heard the words of the Psalm which they were chaunting,—“Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those which rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them

^e Collatio Episcop. apud D'Achery, Spicileg. iii. p. 304.

^f M. Reveillot has very ingeniously, perhaps too ingeniously, worked out the religious history of the reign of King Gundebald (p. 189 et seq.). But he is somewhat tender to the Bishop, who “almost praises Gundebald for the murder of his brothers.” The passage is too characteristic to be omitted: “Flebatis quondam pietate ineffabili funera germanorum (he had murdered them), sequebatur fletum publicum universitatis afflictio, et occulto divinitatis intuitu, instrumentum

mœstitiæ parabantur ad gaudium . . . Minuebat regni felicitas numerum regum personarum et hoc solum servabatur mundo, quod sufficeret imperio (the good Turkish maxim). Ille repositum est quicquid prosperum fuit catholicæ veritati.” This is said of an Arian, but the father of an orthodox son, Sigismund, converted by Avitus.—Epist. v. p. 95.

^g “Valde molestè fero, quod hi Arianam partem Galliarum tenent. Eam cum Dei adiutorio, et superatis eis terram redigamus in ditionem nostram.”—Greg. Tur. ii. 37.

that hate me.”^b The oracular words were piously fulfilled by Clovis. The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Frank. These are not the only illustrations of the Christianity practised by Clovis, and related in perfect simplicity by his monkish historian.¹ Gregory of Tours describes without emotion one of the worst acts which darken the reign of Clovis. He suggested to the son of Sigebert, King of the Ripuarian Franks, the assassination of his father, with the promise that the murderer should be peaceably established on the throne. The murder was committed in the neighbouring forest. The parricide was then slain by the command of Clovis, who in a full parliament of the nation solemnly protested that he had no share in the murder of either; and was raised by general acclamation on a shield, as King of the Ripuarian Franks. Gregory concludes with this pious observation:—“For God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was pleasing in his sight.”^k Yet

^b Psalm xlviii. 39. Did Clovis understand Latin? or did the orthodox clergy of Tours interpret the flattering prophecy?

¹ Miracles accompany his bloody arms; a hind shows a ford; a light from the church of St. Hilary in Poitiers summons him to hasten his attack before the arrival of the Italian troops of Theodoric in the camp of the Visigoth. The walls of Angoulême fall of their own accord. Gregory Tur. ii. 37. According to the life of S. Remi, Clovis massacred all the Arian Goths in the city—Ap. Bouquet, iii. p. 379. S. Cassianus, the Bishop of

Arles, when that city was besieged by Clovis and the Burgundians, was suspected of assisting the invader by more than his prayers. He was imprisoned, his biographers assert, his innocence proved.—Vit. S. Casar. in Mabill. Ann. Benedic. sæc. i.

^k Greg. Turon. ii. 42. “Prosternebat enim quotidie Deus hostes ejus sub manu ipsius et augebat regnum ejus, eò quod ambulavit rectè corde omnino, et fecit quæ placita erant in oculis ejus.” There follows a long list of assassinations and acts of the darkest treachery. “Clovis fit pour tous les petits rois des Francs

Gregory of Tours was a prelate, himself of gentle and blameless manners, and of profound piety.

Born A.D.
539-594.

Throughout, indeed, this dark period of the contest between the Franks, the Visigoths, and the Burgundians for the dominion of France, as well as through the long dreary annals of the Merovingian kings, it will be necessary, as well as just, to estimate the character, influence, and beneficent workings of the clergy on the whole society. But the more suitable place for this inquiry will be when the two races, the Roman provincial and the Teutonic, are more completely mingled, though not fused together, for it was but gradually that the clergy, who never ceased to be Roman in the language of their services and of letters, ceased to be so in sentiment, and throughout northern France especially, in blood and descent. There is more even at this time of the first conversion of the Franks to Christianity, in the close alliance between the Roman clergy of Gaul with the Franks, than the contest of Catholicism with heterodoxy. The Arian clergy of the Visigoths were probably, to a considerable extent, of Teutonic race, some of them, like Ulphilas, though provincials of the Empire by descent, of Gothic birth. Their names have utterly perished; this may partly (as has been said) be ascribed to the jealousy of the Catholic writers, the only annalists of the time. But the conversion of the Franks was wrought

Influence of
clergy.

Clergy Latin.

par une suite de perfidies."—Michelet, H. de France, i. 209. The note recounts the assassinations. Throughout, the triumph of Clovis is the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. "Dominus enim se vult credentibus, etc. multiplicata restituit; hæretici vero nec acquirunt, sed quod videntur habere, auferunt. Probabat hoc Godigeseli, Gundobaldi, atque Godomari interitus, qui et patriam simul et animas perdiderunt."—Prolog. ad lib. iii.

by the Latin clergy. The Franks were more a federation of armed adventurers than a nation migrating with their families into new lands; they were at once more barbarous and more exclusively warlike. It would probably be long before they would be tempted to lay aside their arms and aspire to the peaceful ecclesiastical functions. The Roman Gauls might even imagine that they beheld in the Franks deliverers from the tyranny of ~~their~~^{their} actual masters,^m the Burgundians or Visigoths. Men impatient of a galling yoke pause not to consider whether they are not forging for themselves another more heavy and oppressive. They panted after release from their present masters, perhaps after revenge for the loss of their freedom and their lands, for their degradation, their servitude; and cared not to consider whether it would not be a change from bad masters to worse. Clovis, it is true, had commenced his career by the defeat of Syagrius, the last Roman who pretended to authority in Gaul, and had thus annihilated the lingering remains of the Empire; but that would be either pardoned by the clergy or forgotten in the fond hope of some improvement in their condition under the barbarian sway. It was, of course, a deep aggravation of their degraded state that their masters were not only foreigners, barbarians, conquerors—they were Arians. The Franks, as even more barbarous, were more likely to submit in obedience to ecclesiastical dominion: and so it appears that almost throughout the reign of the Merovingian dynasty the two races held their separate functions—the Franks as kings, the Latins as churchmen. The weak prince who was deposed from his

^m Gregory of Tours ingeniously (clergy) desiderabili amore cupiverunt admits "quod omnes (the Catholic) eos regnare."—l. n. 23.

throne, or the timid one who felt himself unequal to its weight, was degraded, according to the Frankish notion, into a clerk;ⁿ he lost his national eminence and distinction, but disqualified by the tonsure from resuming his civil office, according to the sacerdotal notion, he was admitted to the blessed privilege of the priesthood; while at the same time his feeble and contemptible character was a guarantee against his becoming a dangerous rival for the higher honours of the Church. Hence, on the one hand, the unchecked growth of the sacerdotal authority, and the strong Catholicity of the clergy among the Franks, the retention of all the higher offices, at least in the Church, by the Roman Provincials, till they had become of such power, wealth, and dignity, as to rouse the ambition of the noble and even of the royal families.^o Until that time the two races remained distinct, each in possession of his separate, uncontested function; and each might be actuated by high and noble, as well as selfish and ambitious motives. The honest and simple German submitted himself to the comparatively civilised priest of that God whom he now worshipped—the expounder of that mysterious creed before which he had bowed down in awe

ⁿ Queen Clotilda, when her two sons seized their nephews, her favourite grandsons (the children of Chlodowig), and gave her the choice of their death or tonsure, answered like a Frankish queen, "*Socius mihi est, si ad regnum non veniant, mortuos eos videre quam vivos.*"—iii. 18.

^o In the year 566 a certain Meroveus, from whose name he may be concluded to have been a Frank, appears as Bishop of Poitiers.—Greg. Turon. ix. 40. Compare Planck,

Christliche Kirchliche Verfassung, ii. p. 96. It is a century later that, at the trial of Prætextatus, Archbishop of Rouen, are twelve prelates, six Teutons—Ragheremod, of Paris; Landowald, Bayeux; Remahane, Coutances; Merowig, Poitiers; Melulf, Senlis; Berthran, Bourdeaux. Compare Thierry, *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, the one writer who, by his happy selection and artistic skill, has made the Merovingian history readable (tome ii. p. 135).

—the administrator in those imposing rites to which he was slowly, and, as it were, jealously admitted,—the awarder of his eternal doom. On the other hand the clergy, fully possessed with the majesty of their divine mission, would hold it as profanation to impart its sanctity to a rude barbarian. Not merely would Roman pride find its consolation in what thus maintained its influence and superiority, and look down in compassion on the ignorance of the Teuton—his ignorance even of the language of their sacred records, and of the services of their religion; the Romans would hold themselves the heaven-commissioned teachers of a race long destined to be their humble and obedient scholars.

We return to the general view of the conversion of the German races. The effect of this infusion of Teutonic blood into the whole Roman system, and this establishment of a foreign dominant people (of kindred manners, habits, and religion, though of various descent) in the separate provinces of the Empire which now were rising into independent kingdoms, upon the general Christian society, and on the Christianity of the age, demands attentive consideration. Though in each ancient province, and in each recent kingdom, according to the genius of the conquering tribe, the circumstances of the conquest and settlement, and the state of the Roman population, many strong differences might exist, there were some general results which seem to belong to the whole social revolution. In one important respect the Teutonic temperament coincided with Christianity in raising the moral tone. In all that relates to sexual intercourse, the Roman society was corrupt to its core, and the contagion had spread throughout the provinces. Christianity had probably wrought its change rather on the few higher and

Effects of
conversion
on Teutons.

more distinguished individuals than on the whole mass of worshippers. Most of these few, no doubt, had broken the bonds of habits and manners by a strong and convulsive effort, not to cultivate the purer charities of life, but in the aspiration after virtue unattainable by the many. Celibacy had many lofty minds and devoted hearts at its service, but it may be doubted whether conjugal fidelity had made equal progress. Christianity had secluded a certain number from the world and its vices; but on the world itself, now outwardly Christian, it had made in this respect far less impression. Not that it was without power. The courts of the Christian Emperors, notwithstanding their crimes, weaknesses, and intrigues, had been awed, even on the throne, to greater decency of manners. Neither Rome, nor Ravenna, nor Byzantium, had witnessed, they would not have endured, a Nero or an Elagabalus. The females (believing the worst of the early life of the Empress Theodora) were more disposed on the whole to the crimes of ambition, and political or religious intrigue, than to that flagrant licentiousness of the wives and mothers of the older Cæsars. But the evil was too profoundly seated in the habits of the Roman world to submit to the control of religion—of religion embraced at first by so large a portion, from the example of others, from indifference, from force, from anything rather than strong personal conviction, and which had now been long received merely as an hereditary and traditional faith. The clergy themselves, as far as may be judged, did not stand altogether much above the general level. They had their heroes of continence, their spotless examples of personal purity; but though in general they might outwardly submit to the hard law of celibacy, by many it was openly violated, by many more secretly eluded;

On moral
purity.

and, as ever has been, the denial of a legitimate union led to connexions more unrestricted and injurious to public morality. Scarcely a Provincial Council but finds itself called upon to enact more stringent, and, it should seem, still ineffective prohibitions.

Whether as a reminiscence of some older civilisation, German character in this respect. or as a peculiarity in their national character, the Teutons had always paid the highest respect to their females, a feeling which cannot exist without high notions of personal purity, by which it is generated, and in its turn tends to generate. The colder northern climate may have contributed to this result. This masculine modesty of the German character had already excited the admiration, perhaps had been highly coloured by the language, of Tacitus, as a contrast to the effeminate voluptuousness of the Romans—marriages were held absolutely sacred, and producing the most perfect unity; adulteries rare, and visited with public and ignominious punishment.^p The Christian teachers, in words not less energetic, though wanting the inimitable conciseness of the Roman annalist, endeavour to shame their Latin brethren by the severity of Teutonic morals, and to rouse them from their dissolute excesses by taunting them with their degrading inferiority to barbarians, heathens, and heretics. Salvian must be heard with some reserve in his vehement denunciation against the licentiousness of the

^p "Inesse quietum sanctum aliquid nec corrumpere et corrumpi sæculum videtur. . . . Sic unum accipiunt quantum, quomodo unum corpus unamque vitam, ne ulla cogitatio ultra, ne longior cupiditas, ne tanquam manum, sed tanquam matrimonium ament."—XVIII. XIX.

. . . Nemo . . . illic vitam videt,

5th century. He is seeking to vindicate God's providential government of the world in abandoning the Roman and the Christian to the sway of the pagan and the barbarian. "Among the clastic barbarians, we alone are unchaste; the very barbarians are shocked at our impurities.* Among themselves they will not tolerate whoredom, but allow this shameful licence to the Romans as an inveterate usage. We cherish, they execrate, incontinence; we shrink from, they are enamoured of purity; fornication, which with them is a crime and a disgrace, with us is a glory."⁴ Salvian describes the different races, who, though in other respects varying in their character, and some more conspicuous than others for these virtues, were all nevertheless far superior to the Romans. The Goths are treacherous, but continent; the Alemanni less treacherous, and also less continent; the Franks false, but hospitable; the Saxons savagely cruel, but remarkable for chastity.[†] The Vandals, if Salvian is to be credited, maintained their severe virtue, not only in Spain, but under the burning sun and amidst the utter depravity of African morals, and in that state of felicity, luxury, and wealth which usually unmans the mind. They not only held in abomination the more odious and unnatural vices which had so deeply infected the habits of Greece and Rome, but all unlawful connexions with the female sex.⁵ According to the same authority, they enforced

⁴ De Gubernat. Dei, l. vii. p. 66. He draws the same contrast between the Roman inhabitants of Spain and their Vandal conquerors

[†] "Gothorum gens perfida sed pudica est, Alemanni impudica sed minus perfida, Franci mendaces sed hospitales,

Saxones crudelitate efferi, sed castitate venerandi."—Ibid.

⁵ "Et certe ob eâ tantum continentissimi ac modestissimi judicandi erant quos non fecisset corruptiores ipsa felicitas . . . igitur in tantâ affluentia rerum atque luxuriâ, nullus eorum

the marriage of the public prostitutes, and enacted severe laws against unchastity, thus compelling the Romans to be virtuous against their will. Under the Ostrogothic kingdom, the manners in Italy might seem to revert to the dignified austerity of the old Roman republic. Theodoric indignantly reproves a certain Bardilas, who had married the wife of an officer (from his name also of Gothic blood) while the husband was absent with the army. He speaks of it as bringing disgrace on the age and on the Gothic character.^t The Ostrogothic law is silent as to incest and the crime against nature, as if, in its lofty purity, it did not imagine the existence of such offences. This code was for the Goths alone; the Romans were still amenable to their own law.^u In the laws of Theodoric the German abhorrence of adultery continued to make it a capital crime; the edict was inexorably severe against all crimes of this class: the seducer or ravisher of a free virgin was forced to marry her, and endow her with a

mollis effectus est abominati enim sunt virorum improbitates; plus adhuc addo, abominati etiam feminarum; horruerunt lustra ac lupanaria, horruerunt contactus concubitusque meretricum.”—De Gub. Dei, l. vii. p. 66.

^t “In injuriam nostrorum temporum, adulterium simulatur, matrimonii lege commissum.” The husband’s name was Pitzenes. It is amusing to hear the King of the Goths reminding unchaste women of the fidelity of turtle doves, who pine away in each other’s absence, and remain in strictly continent widowhood: “Respicite impudicæ gementium turturum castissimum genus, quod si a copulâ fuerit casu intercedente divisum, per-

petuâ se abstinentiæ lege constringit;” and this is a royal or imperial edict.—Cassiodor. Var. i. 83.

^u Sartorius, *Essai sur l’Etat des Peuples d’Italie sous le Gouvernement des Goths* (p. 95). “Odious as homicide is, it would be more odious to punish than to commit that crime in certain cases, as in that of open adultery. See we not that rams, bulls, and goats avenge themselves against their rivals? Shall man alone be unable to preserve the honour of his bed? Examine the cause of Candax; if he only killed the adulterers who dishonoured him, remit all his penalties; if he has slain innocent men, let him be punished.”—*Ibid.* i. 37.

fifth of his estate; if married, he forfeited a third of his property to his victim; if he had no property, he atoned for his crime by death; if the virgin was a slave, the criminal, being a free man, was degraded into a slave of the wife of the maiden's master, if he could not redeem his guilt by supplying two slaves: the rape of a free widow was subject to the capital punishment of adultery. The parents or guardians of a female who had suffered rape were bound to prosecute on pain of exile.

In some provinces, it must be acknowledged, that the vices as well as the religion of Rome assert their unshaken dominion; or rather there is a terrible interchange of the worst parts of each character. It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours. In the conflict or coalition of barbarism with Roman Christianity, barbarism has introduced into Christianity all its ferocity with none of its generosity or magnanimity; its energy shows itself in atrocity of cruelty and even of sensuality. Christianity has given to barbarism hardly more than its superstition and its hatred of heretics and unbelievers. Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.^a The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That King Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter is fearful enough; but we are astounded even in these times with a Bishop of Tours burning a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he

^a See a fearful summary in Loebel, *Gregor von Tours*, pp. 60-74

coveted.⁷ Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the Archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a Bishop and an Archdeacon are her accomplices. She is not content with open violence, she administers poison with the subtlety of a Locusta or a modern Italian, apparently with no sensual design, but from sheer barbarity.

As to the intercourse of the sexes, wars of conquest, where the females are at the mercy of the victors, especially if female virtue is not in much respect, Merovingian times. would severely try the more rigid morals of the conqueror. The strength of the Teutonic character, when it had once burst the bonds of habitual or traditional restraint, might seem to disdain easy and effeminate vice, and to seek a kind of wild zest in the indulgence of lust, by mingling it up with all other violent passions, rapacity and inhumanity. Marriage was a bond contracted and broken on the lightest occasion. Some of the Merovingian kings took as many wives, either together or in succession, as suited either their passions or their politics. Christianity hardly interferes even to interdict incest. King Chlotaire demanded for the fisc the third part of the revenue of the churches; some bishops yielded; one, Injuriosus, disdainfully refused, and Chlotaire withdrew his demands. Yet Chlotaire, seemingly unrebuked, married two sisters at once. Charibert likewise married two sisters: he, however, found a Churchman, but that was Saint Germanus, bold enough to rebuke him. This rebuke the King (the historian quietly writes), as he

had already many wives, bore with patience. Dagobert, son of Chlotaire, King of Austrasia, repudiated his wife Gomatrude for barrenness, married a Saxon slave Mathildis, then another, Regnatrude; so that he had three wives at once, besides so many concubines that the chronicler is ashamed to recount them.² Brunehaut and Fredegonde are not less famous for their licentiousness than for their cruelty. Fredegonde is either compelled or scruples not of her own accord to take a public oath, with three bishops and four hundred nobles as her vouchers, that her son was the son of her husband Chilperic. The Eastern right of having a concubine seems to have been inveterate among the later Frankish kings: that which was permitted for the sake of perpetuating the race was continued and carried to excess by the more dissolute sovereigns for their own pleasure. Even as late as Charlemagne, the polygamy of that great monarch, more like an Oriental Sultan (except that his wives were not secluded in a harem), as well as the notorious licentiousness of the females of his court, was unchecked, and indeed unreproved, by the religion of which he was at least the temporal head, of which the Spiritual Sovereign placed on his brow the crown of the Western Empire. These, however, seem to have been the royal vices of men gradually intoxicated by uncontrolled and irresponsible power, plunging fiercely into the indulgences before they had acquired any of the humanising virtues of advanced civilisation.

In such times the celibacy or even the continence of the clergy was not likely to be very severely observed. The marriage of bishops, if not general, was common.

² "Nomina concubinarum ec quod pluræ erant, increvit huic chronicæ seri."—Fredegar. c. 60.

Francilio had a wife named Clara.^a There is an account of some strange cruelties practised by a bishop's wife.^b

Yet clerical incontinence was not without rebuke from above. Gregory tells a strange story of the pyx with the consecrated host leaping out of a deacon's hands, and flying through the air to the altar. All agreed that the clerk must be polluted. He confessed, it was said, to several acts of adultery.^c

If, however, with some exceptions, more especially this great exception of the Frankish monarchs, Christianity found an unexpected ally in the higher moral tone of the Teutonic races, the religion in other respects and throughout its whole sphere of conquest suffered a serious, perhaps inevitable deterioration. With the world Christianity began rapidly to barbarise. War was the sole ennobling occupation. Even the clergy, after striving for some time to be the pacific mediators between the conquerors and the conquered; to allay here and there the horrors of war, at times by the awe of their own holiness and that of their religion; to keep the churches during the capture of a city as a safe sanctuary for the unarmed, the helpless, the women, and the children; to redeem captives from slavery; to mitigate the tyranny of the liege lord, who as a Christian, perhaps in the ardour of a new convert, was

^a G. T. x. 30. The son of a bishop of Verdun, xii. 35; also iv. 36, ii. 17. Daughter of a bishop, viii. 32. Compare Loebel, Gregor von Tours. Especially, p. 313 and note.

^b viii. 39. In another place of two hermits; one was drunken, one had a wife!

^c One priest only, three women, one of whom was Gregory's mother, wit-

nessed this miracle. Gregory was present, but the privilege was not vouchsafed to him. "Um tantum presbytero, et tribus mulieribus, ex quibus una mater mea erat, hæc videre licitum fuit; cæteri non viderunt. Aderam fateor et ego huic festivitati, sed hæc videre non merui."—*De Glor. Martyr.* vol. ii. p. 361.

humbly submissive to their dictates; even the clergy were at length swept away by the torrent. In the fifth century we find bishops in arms, and at the head of fighting men; and though at first the common feeling protested against this desecration, though bearing arms was prohibited by the decrees of councils: yet where, as in some cases, the wars in which they might engage were defensive, and for the preservation of the most sacred rights of man; the step once taken, the sight once familiarised to this incongruous confusion of the armed warrior and the peaceful ecclesiastic, the evil would grow up with fatal rapidity. When the ecclesiastical dignities and honours, from their wealth and authority, began to tempt the barbarians, who would no longer leave them to the exclusive possession of the Romans, those barbarians would be the more disposed to assume them, if they no longer absolutely imposed inglorious inactivity or humiliating patience. On the other hand, the barbarian invested in the priesthood would more jealously justify himself for thus, in one sense, descending from his high place as a warrior, by retaining some of the habits and character of the free German conqueror. At length, though at a much later period, the tenure of land implying military service, as the land came more and more into the hands of the clergy, the ecclesiastic would be embarrassed more and more by his double function; till at length we arrive at the Prince Bishop, or the feudal Abbot, alternately with the helmet and the mitre on his head, the crozier and the lance in his hand; now in the field in the front of his armed vassals, now on his throne in the church in the midst of his chanting choir.^d

^d The first bishops who appeared in arms, and actually slew their enemies, shocked Gregory of Tours. "Salaria et Sagittarius fratres atque

All things throughout this great social revolution tended to advance and consolidate the sacerdotal power. The clergy, whether as among the Goths and other Arian nations, who had their own bishops, or among the Franks, where they were revered for their intellectual as well as their spiritual superiority, became more completely a separate and distinct corporate body, filling up their own ranks by their own election, with less and less regard even to the assent of the laity; for the barbarous laity, of another race, ceased to pretend to any share of the election of the clergy. They possessed more completely the power of ecclesiastical legislation. In the confusion and breaking up of all ancient titles to property, more would be constantly falling into their hands. The barbarians for the good of their souls would abandon more readily lands which they had just acquired by the sword, and of which they had hardly learned the value; while the Romans, in perpetual danger of being forcibly despoiled, would more easily make over to the safer custody of Churchmen, lands which under such protection they might more securely cultivate. Already in France the kings are jealous of their vast acquisitions; King Chilperic hated the clergy for this reason, and was hated by them with emulous intensity. He complained that all the wealth of the crown was swal-

episcopi qui non cruce cœlesti muniti, sed galeâ aut lanceâ sæculari armati, multos manibus propriis quod pejus est, interfecisse referuntur."—iv. 41. Compare v. 17.—Merovingian France still offers the most startling anomalies. While thus advancing in power, their persons are not sacred in these wild times. The Bishop of Marseilles is exposed to cruel usage. Even the strong feeling of caste has lost its

influence. They are murdered and burned with as little remorse as the profane. Gregory, who stands up on some occasions for their inviolability, on others despondingly acquiesces in their fate; if not in its justice, in its being too much in the common order of things to shock public feeling. Some of them, by his own account, richly deserved their doom.

lowed up by the Church.* The Church revenged itself by consoling visions of Chilperic's damnation. The jurisdiction of the bishops, at first confined to strictly religious concerns, would gradually extend itself, perhaps from confidence in their superior justice, their intellectual superiority, the absence or the deficiency of the administrators of the Roman law, under which everywhere the Romans still lived. Where other magistrates were suppressed, or had forfeited or abandoned their functions, they would become the sole magistrates. Causes regarding property, bequests, and others of a more intricate kind, which might perplex the greater simplicity of the barbaric codes, or embarrass the straightforward justice of barbaric tribunals, would be referred to their superior wisdom. The bishops thus gradually became more independent of their college of presbyters; they grew into a separate order in the State as well as in the Church.

Nor can it be wondered that partly in self defence, partly for his own relative aggrandisement, the weaker and conquered Roman, conscious of his intellectual superiority—especially the Roman ecclesiastic—should abuse his power, and make, as it were, reprisals on the rude and ignorant barbarian conqueror.[†] His own religion would become more and more superstitious, for the more superstitious the more awful. Art and cunning are the natural and constant weapons of enfeebled civilisation against strong invading barbarism. Through-

* "Aiebat enim plerumque, ecce pauper remanet fiscus noster, ecce divitiæ nostræ ad ecclesias translata: nulli penitus nisi soli episcopi regnant; perit honos noster, et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum."—vi. 46.

† The Jews were their rivals in wealth. Cantinus, the cruel Bishop of Tours, has huge money dealings with the Jews. Eufamius borrows large sums of the Jews to buy the same bishopric.—iv. 35.

out the period the strongest superstitious terrors cross the most lawless and most cruel acts.⁸ There are several curious instances in the Frankish annals in which the ecclesiastical kindred speaks more strongly to the alarmed conscience than that of blood to the heart. Those who without compunction, murder their nearest relatives, their children or their husband, have some reluctance to shed the blood of those whom they have held over the baptismal font. Brunehaut spares Borthefrid because she has been godmother to his daughter.

The ecclesiastics must have been almost more than men, certainly far beyond their time, to have resisted the temptation of what would seem innocent or beneficent fraud, to overawe or to control the ignorant barbarian.

The good Bishop Gregory of Tours is himself concerned in an affair in which the violence and religious fears of King Chilperic singularly contrast with the subtlety of the ecclesiastics. Chilperic sends a letter to St. Martin of Tours requesting the Saint to inform him whether he might force Meroveus out of the sanctuary. It will hardly be doubted that he received an answer; and that the majesty of the sanctuary suffered no loss. St. Martin of Tours was the great oracle of the Franco-Latin kingdoms:^h kings flock to his shrine to make their offerings, to hear his judgements. No two cities in the north of France, not even the royal residences, approached the two great ecclesiastical capitals, Rheims and Tours. Lands and wealth were poured at the feet of the Church. Dagobert bestowed twenty-seven ham-

⁸ A bishop of Rheims gives a safe conduct under oath on a chest of relics; —i. p. 514.

but having first stolen away the relics, Michelet writes in his flashing holds the oath not binding.—Fredegar. way, "Ce que Delphes etait pour la c. 97. Eichhorn quotes a similar | Grèce.

lets or towns on the monastery of St. Denys.¹ His son bestowed on St. Remaclus of Tongres twelve square leagues in the forest of Ardennes.^k The Church of Rheims possessed vast territories, some of which it may have received from the careless and lavish bounty of Clovis himself; much more, by a pious anachronism, was made to rest on that ancient and venerable tenure.ⁿ

¹ *Gesta Dagobert.* c. 35.

^m *Vit. S. Sigebert. Austras.* c. 4.

^k This subject is resumed when the Script. Franc. See the curious passage clergy are considered as co-legislators in Frodoard, quoted by Michelet. ~~with~~ the Teutonic kings and people.

CHAPTER III.

Theodoric the Ostrogoth.

THE Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy shows the earliest, and not the least noble form of this new ^{Ostrogothic kingdom} society, which grew out of the yet unfused elements of the Latin and Teutonic races. To the strong opposition between the barbarian and Roman parts of the community was added the almost stronger contrast of religious difference. The Sovereign of Italy, the civil monarch of the Papal diocese, was an Arian.

Theodoric's invasion of Italy was the migration of a people, not the inroad of an army.^a His Goths were accompanied by their wives and children, with all the moveable property which they had possessed in their settlements in Pannonia. Theodoric had extorted from the gratitude and the fears of the Eastern Emperor, if not a formal grant of the kingdom of Italy, a permission to rescue the Roman West from the dominion of Odoacer. The Herulian king, after two great battles, and a siege of three years in Ravenna, wrested from Theodoric a peace, by the terms of which the Herulian and the Gothic monarchs were to reign over ^{Odoacer.} Italy in joint sovereignty. Such treaty could not be lasting. Odoacer, either the victim of treachery, or his own treacherous designs but anticipated by the

^a Compare, on the number of the 'd'Italie sous le Gouvernement des Gothic invaders, Sautonius, *Essai sur Goths*, note, page 242
l'État Civil et Physique des Peuples

superior craft and more subtle intelligence of Theodoric, was assassinated at a banquet.^b The Herulians were dispossessed of the third portion of the lands which they had extorted from the Roman proprietors, and dispersed, some into Gaul, some into other parts of the Empire. The Gothic followers of Theodoric took their place, and Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, commenced a reign of thirty-three years, in ^{A.D. 493-526.} which Italy reposed in peace under his just and vigorous and parental administration.

Throughout the conquest, and the establishment of the Gothic kingdom, the increasing power and importance of the Christian ecclesiastics forces itself upon the attention. They are ambassadors, mediators in treaties, decide the wavering loyalty or instigate the revolt of cities. Even before the expiration of the Empire, Glycerius abdicates the throne, and retires to the bishopric of Salona, not, it should seem, from any strong religious vocation, or weariness of political intrigue. He is afterwards concerned in the murder of ^{Bishops employed.} another of his short-lived successors, the Emperor Nepos, and is promoted, as the reward of his services, to the Archbishopric of Milan. Epiphanius, the Bishop of Pavia, bears to Theodoric at Milan the surrender and offer of allegiance from that great city. John, the Bishop, was employed by Odoacer to negotiate the treaty of Ravenna.^c Before this time, whenever a difficult negotiation occurred, Epiphanius was persuaded to

^b The most probable view of this transaction is, that the Herulian chieftains, impatient of the equal dominion of the Goths, had organised a formidable insurrection, of which Odoacer, possibly not an accomplice, was nevertheless the victim. The Byzantine writers, Procopius, Marcellinus, betray their hatred. Eunodius and Cassiodorus of course favour Theodoric. Gibbon declares against him.

^c Procop. l. i. c. i. p. 2, Edit. Bonn.

undertake it. He had been ambassador from Ricimer to Anthemius, from Nepos to Euric the Visigoth. Theodoric admired the dignified beauty and esteemed the saintliness of character in the Catholic Epiphanius, and perhaps intended that his praises of the bishop should be heard in Pavia, where from his virtues and charities, he enjoyed unbounded popularity: "Behold the man whose peer cannot be found throughout the West: he is the great bulwark of Pavia;—to his care I may entrust my wife and children, and devote myself entirely to war."^d Epiphanius was permitted to plead the cause of the Herulians who had risen in arms in the north of Italy after the death of Odoacer. The eloquence of the bishop arrested the inexorable vengeance or justice of Theodoric. He was employed even on a more apostolic mission—to rescue from slavery those who had been sold or had fled into slavery beyond the Alps. Gundobald the Burgundian and his chieftains melted at the persuasive words of Epiphanius, who entered Pavia at the head of 6000 bond-slaves, rescued by his influence from slavery. Epiphanius made a third journey to Ravenna, to obtain a remission of taxes in favour of his distressed people.^e

The Ostrogothic kingdom was an intermediate state between the Roman Empire and the barbarian monarchies. It was the avowed object of Theodoric to fuse together the Teutonic vigour with the Roman civilization, to alloy the fierceness of the Gothic temperament with the social culture of Italy.^f

^d Ennodii Vita Epiphan.

Rugians, at one time masters of Pavia.

^e Ennodius says of Epiphanius,—^f "Il semper fuerint (Gothi, sc.) in
 "Inter dissidentes principes solus esset, laudis medio constituti, ut et Romano-
 qui pace frueretur amboium."—p. rum prudentiam caperent, et virtutem
 1011. He even overawed the fierce gentium possiderent. . . . Consuetudine

The Romans still held many of the chief civil offices. Liberius, Symmachus, Boethius, Cassiodorus, were the ministers of the Gothic king. Yet the two elements of the society had no tendency to assimilation or union; the justice and wisdom of the king might mitigate, he could not reconcile this discord, which could only be finally extinguished by years of mutual ^{very imper-} intercourse, by intermarriages, and above all by perfect community of religious faith. The Gothic and the Roman races stood apart in laws, in usages, in civil position, as well as in character. Possessors, by the right of conquest, of the one-third of the lands in Italy, of which they exacted the surrender, and for which they tacitly engaged to protect the whole from foreign invasion,⁵ the Goths settled as an armed aristocracy among a people who seemed content to purchase their security at the price of one-third of their possessions. This transfer was carried on with nothing of the violence and irregularity of plunder or confiscation, but with the utmost order and equity. It was, in truth, but a new form of the law of conquest, which Rome had enforced,

nostra fœnis mentibus inseratur donec truculentus animus vivere velle consuescat."—Cassiod. Var. Epist. iii. 23. In another passage he exhorts the Goths to put on the manners of the toga, and to cast off those of barbarism. 'Intelligite homines non tam corporâ vi quam ratione præferri.'—Lib. iii. Epist. 17. When he invaded Gaul, Theodoric declared himself the protector of the Romans: "Delectamur jure Romano vivere quos armis vindicamus. . . . Nobis propositum est, Deo juvante, sic vivere, ut subjecti ne doleant nostrum dominum tardius acquisisse."—iii. 43. But the most clear and distinct indication of his views is in the formula for the appointment of the Count of the Goths: "Unum vos amplectatur vivendi votum, quibus unum esse constat imperium." The anonym. Vales. says that the poor Roman (miser) affected to be a Goth, the rich (utilis) Goth to be a Roman.

⁵ "Vos autem Romani magno studio Gothos diligere debetis, qui in pace numerosos vobis populos faciunt, et universam rempublicam per bella defendunt."—Cassiod. vii. 3.

first upon Italy, afterwards on the world. Nor was it an obsolete and forgotten hardship, the expulsion of a free, and flourishing, and happy peasantry from their paternal homesteads, and hereditary fields; they were only like those more partial no doubt, but more cruel ejections, when the conquering Triumvir, during the later republic, confiscated whole provinces, and apportioned them among his own soldiery.^b The followers of Odoacer had already, if not to so great an extent, enforced the same surrender, and the Goth only expelled the Herulian from his newly acquired estate. Large tracts in Italy were utterly desolate and uncultivated—almost the whole under imperfect culture.¹ This, in the best times of the Roman aristocracy, had been the natural and recorded consequence of the vast estates accumulated by one proprietor, and cultivated by slaves or at best by poor métayers, and was now aggravated by the general ruin of that aristocracy, the difficulty of maintaining slaves, and the effects of long warfare. This revolution at least assisted in breaking up these overgrown properties, combining as it did with constant alienations to the Church, and afterwards to monasteries. Agriculture in Italy received a new impulse,^k the more necessary, as it ceased to

Division of
lands.

^b Theodoric considered that he had succeeded to the right of the Roman people in apportioning land: he prohibited the forcible entrance upon farms without authority.

¹ "Vides universa Italiae loca originarius viduata cultoribus." Read the whole speech of Theodoric to Epiphanius of Pavia on the desolation especially of Liguria.—Ennod. Vit. p. 1014. "Latifundia perdidere Italiam,"

the axiom of all the Roman economists.

^k It is curious that most of these edicts prohibit *exportation*. See Cassiodorus, Var. Lib. i. 31, 34, 35 (a strange document in point of style). Lib. ii. 12, is a prohibition of the export of bacon, an important article of food; 20 gives orders to send corn from Ravenna to Liguria, which was suffering famine. The Gothic army is

command foreign resources. The harvests of the East, and of Egypt and Libya, had long been assigned to the maintenance of the new capital; and Western Africa, desolated by the Vandals, no longer poured in her supplies. Theodoric watched with parental solicitude the progress of agriculture, and the irregular and uncertain supplies of corn to his Italian subjects, who were now thrown on their own resources. His correspondence is full of orders on this important subject. Italy began to export corn. The price, both of corn and wine, fell to a very moderate amount.¹

The Gothic king claimed all the imposts formerly paid to the imperial treasury; the *Curie* were still responsible for the collection, but Theodoric inculcated moderation in the exacting of the Imperial claims.^m The Goths appear to have been liable to the same taxes with the Romans.ⁿ The clergy had as yet no immunities. Theodoric himself aspired to be Theodoric. the impartial sovereign of both races. In him met and blended the Roman and the Goth: in peace he exchanged the Gothic military dress for the purple of the Roman Emperor.^o He preserved the ancient titles both of the Republic and of the Empire. He appointed Consuls, Patricians, Quæstors, as well as Counts of largesses, of provinces, and some of the more servile titles of the East.^p The conqueror was earnestly desirous

Gaul was supported by the province, solidum ipsius tempore fuerunt, et not from Italy (iii. 41, 2), and during vinum triginta amphoræ in solidum." —Anon. Vales. Without ascertaining the exact relative value, we may infer that these were unusually low prices.

and, Theodoric endeavoured to obtain corn from Spain for the supply of Rome; but it seems the dealers had found a better market in Africa (v. 35).

^m Var i. 19, iv. 19.

ⁿ iv. 14.

^o Muratori Annal. d'Italia, iv. 380.

^p See the sixth book of the *Epistles*.

¹ "Sexaginta modios tritici um in

to secure for his Italian subjects the blessings of peace : though his arms were employed in Gaul for thirty out of thirty-three years of his reign, Italy, under his dominion, escaped the ravages of war.¹ The police was so strict throughout Italy, that merchants thronged from all parts. A man might leave his silver or gold as safely on his farm as in a walled city.² He bequeathed peace to his successors ; he encouraged all the arts of peace. The posts were arranged on a new and effective footing.³ The great roads, the bridges, the ruined walls, and falling buildings were restored to their ancient strength and splendour. Verona, Pavia,⁴ above all Ravenna, were adorned with new palaces, porticos, baths, amphitheatres, basilicas, and, doubtless, churches. In the latter city Theodoric avowedly aimed at rivalling the magnificence of Rome ; but Rome was not plundered or sacrificed to the new capital. The care of Theodoric was extended to the restoration of her stately but injured edifices.⁵ The Cloacæ, which excited the wonder of the barbarians, and distinguished Rome from all other cities, were to be repaired entirely at the public cost.⁶ The water from the aqueducts was no longer to be directed to private use, for the turning of mills, or irrigation of gardens, but devoted to the general

¹ Ennodius says, in Vit. Epiphan.—“Cujus post triumphum spoliatum vagina gladium nullus aspexit.”—p. 1012. “Ergo praeclarus et bonæ voluntatis in omnibus, qui regnavit annos xxxiii. cujus temporibus felicitas est sequuta Italiam per annos xxx. ita ut etiam pax pergentibus esset (*Pergentibus successoribus ejus*).”—Wagner’s note, Anonym. Vales.

² Anonym. Vales.

³ Epist. i. 29, iv. 47, v. 5.

⁴ Anonym. Vales. This writer, in his admiration of the golden age of Theodoric, declares that he did not repair the gates of the cities, as, being now never closed, the inhabitants entering and going out by night as well as by day, they had become of no use. “Hoc per totam Italiam augurium habebat, ut nulli civitatis portas faceret.”

⁵ Var. i. 21. Compare ii. 34.

⁶ Var. iii. 30.

benefit of the citizens.^a The prefect of the city and his lieutenant, the Count of Rome, and the public architect² were especially charged to keep up the forests of stately buildings, the statues which peopled the city, the herds of equestrian images.³ In these terms the barbarians expressed their astonishment at the yet inexhausted treasures of art in the imperial city. The florid panegyric of Theodoric describes the aged city as renewing her youth; noble edifices were completed nearly as soon as planned. Theodoric is almost a second Romulus—as it is greater to ward off the fall, than to have commenced the foundations of a city.^b

When Theodoric appeared in Rome, the Emperor might seem to revive in greater power and majesty than he had displayed since the days of Theodosius the Great. The largesses of corn were distributed, though to a smaller population, with a liberality which rivalled the earlier days of the Empire.^c

Though himself taking no pleasure in savage or idle amusements, the barbaric king, considering such sub-

^a Var. iii. 31.

^b On the general policy of Theodoric in this respect, “Decet principem cuncta, quæ ad rem publicam præstat augendam, et verè dignum est regem adificis palatia decorare. Absit enim ut ornatum cedamus veterum, qui impares non sumus beatitudinis sæculorum.”—Var. i. 6. “Decora facies impem, testimonium præconiale regnorum.”—Var. vii. 5.

^c “Mirabilis sylva mænum, populus statuarum, greges equorum.”—Var. vii. 5: compare vii. 15, 16. These latter are the formularies for the appointment of the Comes Romanus, and the architect of the public works—

Ennod. apud Simond. p. 967.

^b Theodoric commands marmorarii to be sent from Ravenna to Rome: these were workers in marble (we hear nothing of painters or sculptors), which art the barbarians seem to have especially admired. “Qui examè diversa conjungunt et vena colludentibus illicata naturalem faciem laudabiliter mentiuntur. . . . De arte veniat, quod vimeat naturam, discoloria crusta marmorum gratissimâ picturâ unum varietate texantur.”—Var. i. 6.

^c Anonym. Vales. Compare the formulary for the appointment of the Præfectus annonæ.

jects not quite beneath the care of the sovereign, perhaps not without some politic design to occupy the proud and turbulent metropolis, indulged his subjects with their ancient spectacles, in such pomp as to recall the famous names of Trajan and Valentinian.^d The gladiators alone had been suppressed by the influence of Christian opinion; and even if humanity had not won this triumph, Rome had no longer barbarian captives whom she could devote to the carnage of these mimic wars. But the arena was still open to the combats of wild beasts.^e The pantomimes, of which alone Theodoric speaks with interest, were frequent and splendid.^f The chariot races were attended with all the old passionate ardour, and the contending colours were espoused with fanatic zeal by the opposite factions, on which the Sovereign, though he did not condescend to take a part, looked with indulgence. He allowed the utmost licence to the expression of public feeling, and strongly reprobated the officious or haughty interference of the Senate for attempting to repress this legitimate freedom.^g

But Theodoric, in his religious character, is the chief object of our study. The Christian sovereign must find

^d Anonym. Vales. The edicts are prefaced with a kind of apology. "Licet inter gloriosas reipublicæ curas . . . pars *munera* videatur, principem de spectaculis loqui, tamen pro amore reipublicæ Romanæ non pigebit has cogitationes intrare."—Var. i. 20.

^e Var. v. 42, where the feritas spectaculi is reproved. Among Theodoric's buildings is mentioned an amphitheatre at Pavia.

^f He calls it a wonderful art, which is often more expressive than language. —Var. i. 20.

^g "Mores autem graves in spectaculo quis requirit? Ad Cnecum nesunt convenire Catones."—i. 27. It is evident that the senate and the people had taken different sides. The senators are reproved for introducing then armed slaves among the audience. On the other hand, the complaint of a senator of personal insult was to be carried before the prætorian præfect. There is a remarkable tone of good-humoured moderation in all the edicts. compare Var. i. 27, 30 to 33.

his proper place in the history of Christianity. The King of the Ostrogoths not merely held together in peace and amity the two races, the Roman and the barbarian, but even the Orthodox and the Arian reposed throughout his reign if not in friendly quiet, at least without any violation of the public peace.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that in a state so divided, the Sovereign was of the religion of the few. He escaped the temptation to persecute, since it would have been idle to suppose that he could persuade or compel so strong a majority to embrace his detested opinions. If the wise spirit of toleration had not led him to moderate measures, the good sense of the Sovereign would have compelled him to respect the inveterate tenets of the larger, the more intellectually powerful part of his subjects. Still, though his Byzantine education might have warned Theodoric against the danger, if the Sovereign should plunge too deeply into ecclesiastical affairs, his forbearance was nevertheless extraordinary, considering the all-searching, all-pervading activity of his administration; and that the religious supremacy had been so long a declared prerogative of that Imperial power, which had now passed into his hands. Imperial edicts since the days of Constantine had been solicited, respected, enforced by the hierarchs so long as they spoke the dominant doctrine; they had become part of the code of the Empire; even when adverse to the prevailing opinion, they had been always supported by one faction at least, and received with awe by the more indifferent multitudes. The doctrine that the clergy, the bishops, or the Roman Pontiff, were the sole legislators of Christianity, was so precarious and undefined, that we still cannot altogether withhold our admiration

from the wisdom of Theodoric. The Arianism, indeed, of the Goths had not the fresh ardour or burning zeal of recent proselytism. It was a kind of religious accident, arising out of their first conversion, which happened to take place during the reign of an Arian Emperor, and through Arian missionaries. It had settled into a quiet hereditary faith. There was no peculiar congeniality in its tenets with the Teutonic mind, which was rather disposed to receive what it was taught with implicit faith; and, though no doubt averse to the subtleties of the Greek theology, neither comprehended, nor cared to comprehend, these controversies. It was content to adhere to the original creed,^b or, possibly, might feel some pride in differing from the abject race, over which it asserted its civil and military superiority.

The serene impartiality of Theodoric's government in religious affairs extorts the praise of the most zealous Catholic.^c He attempted nothing against the Catholic faith. Towards the close of the Gothic monarchy, the royal ambassadors to Belisarius defied their enemies to prove a case in which the Goths had persecuted the Catholics.^d Theodoric treated the Pope, the Bishops, and Clergy, with grave respect: in the more distinguished, such as Epiphanius, he ever placed the highest esteem and confidence. We shall

^b Salvian is inclined to judge the heresy of the barbarians with charity; perhaps that he might inveigh more fiercely against the vices of the Catholic Romans. "Barbari quippe homines, immo potius humane eruditiois expertes, qui nihil omnino sciunt, nisi quod a doctoribus suis audiunt, quod audiunt, sic sequuntur . . . hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes."—De

Gubernat. Dei, lib. v.

^c "Nihil contra religionem catholicam tentans," thus writes the anonymous historian, himself a devout Catholic. Ennodius, in praising the religion, forgets the Arianism of Theodoric.—Paneg. p. 971. Anonym. Vales.

^d Procop. de bell. Gothar. l. c. 8.

behold him showing as much reverence, and even bounty, to the Church of St. Peter, as though he had been a Catholic. The poor who were dependent on that Church were maintained by his liberality.^m The Arian clergy also shared in the tolerant sentiments of their King. Of their position, character, influence; of the churches they built or occupied; of their services, of their processions, of their ceremonies; of any aggression or intrigue on their part; of any collision, which we might have supposed inevitable with the Latin clergy, history, and history entirely written by the Catholics, is totally silent; and that silence is the best testimony, either to their unexampled moderation, as the religious teachers of the few indeed, but those few the conquerors and rulers, or to the wiser policy of the King, which could constrain even honest religious zeal. Theodoric himself adhered firmly but calmly to his native Arianism; but, all the conversions seem to have been from the religion of the King; even his mother became a Catholic,ⁿ and some other distinguished persons of the court embraced a different creed without forfeiting the royal favour.^o Theodoric was the protector of Church property,^p which he himself increased

^m Procop. Hist. Arcan., p. 145, edit. Bonn.

ⁿ "Mater Theodoricæ, Euvileva dicta, catholica quidem erat quæ in baptismo Eusebia dicta."—Anonym. Vales.

^o Note of Valesius to Anonym. at the end of Wagner's Ammianus Marcellinus, page 399.—Var. x. 34 a. 26. These cases belong to the successors of Theodoric. With Gibbon, I reject the story of his beheading a Catholic priest for turning Arian in order to

gain his favour! It is most probable that the man had been guilty of some capital crime, and sought to save his life by apostacy. It was not improbably either Theodorus or Count Odoiu, who had formed a conspiracy against him in Rome, and was beheaded for his treason: compare Hist. Miscel. p. 612.

^p Var. iv. 17, orders to his general Ibas in Gaul to restore certain lands to the Church of Narbonne.

by large grants.^a This property, with some exceptions, was still liable to the common imposts. His wise finance would admit no exemptions, but in gifts he was prodigal to magnificence. The clergy were amenable to the common law of the Empire, and were summoned before the royal courts (the stern law would not be eluded) for all ordinary crimes;^b but all ecclesiastical offences were left to the ecclesiastical authorities.^c Nor, although the Herulian Odoacer had claimed and exercised the right of confirming the Papal election, did Theodoric interfere in those elections until compelled by the sanguinary tumults which distracted the city. Even then he interfered only as the anxious guardian of the public peace, and declined the arbitration between the conflicting claims, which both parties, hoping for his support, endeavoured to force on the reluctant monarch.

The feuds of the Roman clergy, which broke out on the customary occasion of the election of a new Pope, and brought them to the foot of their Arian sovereign, may be traced back to a more remote source. Anastasius II., as has been seen, during his short pontificate, had deviated into the paths of peace and conciliation. He had endeavoured by

A.D. 498.
Contested
election for
the Popedom.

^a "If," he writes to Count Gebetic, "in our piety, we bestow lands on the church, we ought to maintain rigidly what she possesses already."—Var. iv. 20.

^b Januarius, Bishop of Salona, is sued for a debt, though for lights for the church; a Bishop Peter for the restitution of an inheritance; the Priest Laurence for sacrilegious violation of a tomb in search of treasure; Antony, Bishop of Pola, for the restitution of a

house: compare Du Roure, Hist. de Théodoric, i. p. 358.

^c See the celebrated privilege accorded to the clergy of Rome by Athalaric—Var. viii. 24. This, however, was no more than arbitration. "Exceptos a tramite justitiæ non patimur inveniri."—Cassiod. ii. 29. Yet Theodoric, from respect, was unwilling to punish a priest. "Scelus quod nos pro sacerdotali honore reliquimus impunitum."—iv. 18.

mildness and by no important concession (he insisted not on the condemnation of Acacius), to reunite the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. This unwonted policy had apparently formed two parties in the Roman clergy, one inclined to the gentler measures of Anastasius, the other to the sterner and more inexorable tone of his predecessors. Each party elected their Pope, the latter the Deacon Symmachus, the former the Archpresbyter Laurentius.[†] The rival Pontiffs were consecrated on the same day, one in the Lateran Church, the other in that of St. Mary. At the head of the party of Laurentius, stood Festus or Faustus Niger, the chief of the Senatorial order. He had been the ambassador of Theodoric at Constantinople, to demand the acknowledgment of the Goth as King of Italy. He had succeeded in his mission; perhaps had been prevailed upon to attempt the reconciliation of the two Churches, either by persuading the acceptance of the Henoticon by the Roman clergy, or more probably on the terms of compromise approved by Pope Anastasius. The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the senate, and the populace were divided; the streets of the Christian city ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife.[‡] The conflicting claims of the prelates were brought before the throne of Theodoric. The simple justice of the Goth decided that the bishop who had the greater number of suffrages, and had been first consecrated,

Dec. 22.
A.D. 499.

[†] Anastasius died Nov. 17.—Muratori, sub ann.

[‡] Each party charged the other with these cruelties. The author of the Hist. Miscell. asserts that Festus and Probinus, of the party of Laurentius, slew in the midst of Rome the

greater part of the clergy and a great number of citizens: a fragment of a writer on the other side (published by the impartial Muratori) ascribes these acts of violence, slaughter, and pillage, with many other vices, to Symmachus. Compare Annal. d'Ital. sub ann. 498.

had the best right to the throne. Symmachus was acknowledged as Pope: he held a synod at Rome which passed two memorable decrees, one almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing, either for obtaining subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises for the papacy during the lifetime of the Pope; * the other declared the election to be in the majority of the clergy, thus virtually abrogating the law of Odoacer. Laurentius (the rival Pope was present at this synod) subscribed its decrees, † and returned to the more peaceful, perhaps to a wise man, the more enviable bishopric of Nocera.

During this interval of peace, Theodoric for the first time visited the imperial city. He was met by Pope Symmachus at the head of his clergy, by the Senate, which still numbered some few old and famous names, Anicii, Albini, Marcelli, and by the whole people, who crowded with demonstrations of the utmost joy around their barbarian sovereign. Catholic and Arian, Goth and Roman, mingled their acclamations. Theodoric performed his devotions in St. Peter's with the fervour of a Catholic. In the Senate he swore to maintain all the imperial laws, the rights and privileges of the Roman people. He celebrated the Circensian games, in commemoration of all his triumphs, with the utmost magnificence; ordered a distribution of one hundred and twenty bushels of corn

* It was the language of the law de Ambitu, applied to ecclesiastical distinctions. It is enacted "propter frequentes ambitus quorundam, et ecclesiæ puritatem, vel populi collectionem, quæ molesta et nunqua in-

competenter episcopatum desiderantium generavit aviditas." Labbe, Concil., p. 1313.

† Baronius sub ann. Muratori has some doubts.

annually to the poor, and set apart two hundred pounds of gold for the restoration of the imperial palace. The Bishop Fulgentius, witness of the splendour of Theodoric's reception, breaks out into these rapturous words: "If such be the magnificence of earth, what must be that of the heavenly Jerusalem!"* Theodoric remained in Rome six months, and then returned to Ravenna.

During all this period, and the three or four following years, the faction of Laurentius were watching their opportunity to renew the strife.^y Fear-^{Charges against Symmachus.} ful charges began to be rumoured against Symmachus, no less than adultery,^z and the alienation of the property of the see. Faustus, his implacable adversary, with the Consul Probinus and great part of the Senate, supported these criminations. The accusation was brought before the judgement seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna, and confined in Rimini. ^{Tumults in Rome.} But finding the prejudices in Ravenna darkening against him, he escaped and returned to Rome. Laurentius had also secretly entered the capital. The sanguinary tumults between the two factions broke out with greater fury; priests were sacrilegiously slain, monasteries fired, and even sacred virgins treated with the utmost indignity. The Senate petitioned the King to send a visitor to judge the cause of the Pontiff. ^{A.D. 503.} A royal commission was issued to Peter,

* Anonym. Vales. Vita B. Fulgentii. Veronensis, published by Muratori. I have endeavoured to harmonize

† There are two accounts of these transactions,—one that of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, or the anonymous papal biographer, favourable to Symmachus; the other the anonymous Ennodius, p 1366.

‡ Anonym. Verona —confirmed by Ennodius, p 1366.

Bishop of Altino. But instead of a calm mediator between the conflicting parties, or an equitable judge, the visitor threw himself into the party of Laurentius.^a The possessions of the Church were, in part at least, seized and withheld from Symmachus; he was commanded to give up the slaves of his household that they might be examined,^b it should seem, by torture according to the ancient usage.^c

Theodoric, still declining the jurisdiction over these ecclesiastical offences, summoned a synod of Italian prelates to meet at Rome. The synod held two successive sessions, and throughout their proceedings may be traced their consciousness of their embarrassing position, which is increased as the reports of these proceedings have passed through later writers.^d They were assembled under the authority of a layman, an heretical sovereign, too powerful to be disobeyed, and acting with such cautious dignity, justice, and impar-

Synods of
Rome.

^a Ennod. *Apologet. pro Synod.*, p. 987.

^b This corresponded with the two heads of accusation. The former provided against the alleged alienation of the church property, the latter referred to that of adultery.

^c This is a remarkable fact, in the first place, showing that slaves formed the household of the Pope, and that, by law, they were yet liable to torture. This seems clear from the words of Ennodius, "*Sed, credo, replicabitis: veritatem quam sponte prolata in illis vox habere non poterat, hanc diversis cruciatibus e latebris suis religiosus tortor exegerat, ut dum penis corpora solverentur, quæ gesta fuisse noverat anima non celaret.*" Ennodius is so

obscure and figurative that he may seem to say, in the next sentence, that this proceeding was illegal, perhaps contrary to the canons. He appears to consider it most contumelious that ecclesiastics should be judged on servile evidence.

^d The whole question of the number and dates of the synods held at this time is inextricably obscure. I chiefly follow Muratori. The *synodus palmaris* is usually considered the fourth. One, in all probability two, were held by Symmachus before this new strife. The fourth was apparently a continuation of the third, but held in a different place—unless the third was one held by Peter of Altino.

tiality as to command respect. They were assembled to judge the supreme Pontiff, the Metropolitan of the west, the asserted, and by most acknowledged, head of Christendom. Symmachus himself had the prudence to express his concurrence in the convocation of this synod. At the first session he set forth to attend the Council. He was attacked by the adverse party, showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the Pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard. The final, named the Palmary, synod was held in some edifice or hall in the palace called by that name; of this assembly the accounts are somewhat more full and distinct. Throughout appears the manifest struggle in the ecclesiastical senate between the duty of sub-^{Decree of the Palmary Synod}mitting to the King, who earnestly urges them to restore peace to Rome and to Italy, and the reluctance to assume jurisdiction over the Bishop of Rome. Some expressions intimate that already the Bishop of Rome was held to be exempt from all human authority, and could be judged by God alone. If the Pope is called in question, the whole episcopacy of the Church is shaken to its foundation.*

Symmachus, however, had the wisdom to suppress all jealousy of a Council † whose authority alone could com-

* "In sacerdotibus cæteris potest, si quid forte nutaverit, reformari: at si papa urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus videbitur, non jam episcopus, vacillare."—Avit. ad Senat. apud Labbe, p. 1365. Avitus uses this argument to the senators of Rome. "Nec minus diligatis in ecclesiâ nostrâ sedem Petri, quam in civitate apicem mundi;" but Avitus acknowledges all priests, even the Pope, to be amenable

to secular tribunals, of course for secular offences, "quia sicut subditos nos esse terrenis potestatibus jubet arbiter cæli; staturos nos ante reges et principes in *quacunque accusatione* prædicens; ita non facile datur intelligi, qua vel ratione, vel lege ab inferioribus (inferior in ecclesiastical order) eminentior judicetur."

† "Judicia et iste voluit, amavit, attraxit, ingressus est; et quod posset

pletely clear him of these formidable accusations, and which he probably knew to be favourably impressed with his innocence. With the full authority of a synod of one hundred and twenty bishops he resumed the pontifical throne, without having compromised his dignity by thus condescending to their jurisdiction. In the wording of the sentence the Council claims at once the authority of the Holy Ghost, yet confines the justification of Pope Symmachus to immunity and freedom from censure before men;^g it leaves to the secret counsel of God the ultimate decision which they might not presume to pronounce;^h nevertheless, with inconsistency, which it is difficult to understand, they seem to grant permission to the Pope to offer the divine mysteries to the Christian people in all the churches of his jurisdiction.ⁱ

fideli corda doloris justis aculeis excitare, venerando concilio etiam contra se si mereretur, indulsit."—Ennod., p. 981.

§ "Quantum ad homines respect (quia totum causis obsidentibus superius designatis, constat arbitrio divino fuisse dimissum) sit immunis et liber, et Christianæ plebi sue aliquâ de objectis oblatione, in omnibus ecclesiis suis, ad jus sedis suæ pertinentibus, tradat divina mysteria."—Labbe, p. 1325.

^h Considering the horror in which the crime of adultery was held in an ecclesiastic, we can scarcely suppose, either that the severe Theodoric would not have driven him from his presence, or that an assemblage of prelates would have attempted to shield a pontiff, of precarious and disputed title, without full and conclusive evidence of his guiltlessness.

ⁱ The decisions of this synod were indeed impeached by the enemies of

Symmachus, and Ennodius found it necessary to vindicate them in an apology, as he thought, eloquent, and therefore in parts altogether unintelligible, at least so as to give but obscure glimpses of the facts. He would seem, perhaps only figuratively, to retort the charge of adultery against the partisans of Laurentius.—p. 992. At the close, Ennodius personifies Rome, who has still some compunctious feelings for the inevitable damnation of all her older heroes. "Quæ Cinos, Torquatos, Camillos, quos Ecclesia non regeneravit, et reliquos misit, plurimæ proles infœcunda mater, ad Tartarum, dum exhaustis emarui male facta visceribus; quia Fabios servata patria non redemit, Decus multo sudore gloria parta nil præstitit: profligata est operum sine fide innocentia: criminosus junctus est, aquo observantissimus Scipio."—p. 993. apud Sumond.

Content with having restored peace to the Roman see, Theodoric kept aloof from the religious dissensions which brooded in deepening darkness over the East. The Gothic king was devoting himself, dare we not say, to the more Christian office of maintaining the peace, securing the welfare, promoting the civilisation, lightening the financial burthens of his people;^k he was exercising for the benefit of Italy, the virtues of wisdom, justice, and humanity. His foreign wars in Pannonia, with a horde of the Bulgarian race, in Gaul, in defence of his kindred the Visigoths against the ambitious Franks, brought fame to the king, without disturbing the repose, or interrupting the progress of improvement in Italy. Far different was the state of the East; the long religious quarrel in which the Emperor Anastasius had been engaged, had shaken its throne to the base, it needed only a successful insurrection to degrade it to still lower humiliation.

The Pope Symmachus watched no doubt with profound interest the holy war which had now broken out in the East. The polemic controversies had become the causes or pretext of revolt and battles. The formidable Scythian Vitalianus (with whom Theodoric had some political connexion on account of the hostilities in which he had been involved on the Dacian frontier with the Eastern empire) had raised the standard of rebellion and of orthodoxy against the aged Anastasius. Symmachus did not live to witness the sad latter years of the Em-

^k "Sensimus auctas illationes, vos addita tributa nescitis. Ita utcumque sub admiratione perfectum est, ut et fiscus crescebat, et privata utilitas nulla damna perferret."—Var. ii. 16. read with that reserve which these eloquent adulations suggest; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that Eunodius was a Catholic and a bishop.

The panegyric of Ennodius must be

peror Anastasius; the revolt of Vitalianus; the hollow peace on the hard conditions of religious submission; the full acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon, the restoration of the exiled Catholic Bishops, and the summoning an Œcumenic Council at Heraclea.

His successor Hormisdas^m reaped the fruits of the humiliation of the Eastern Emperor, and became, though at first the vassal, at least the humble subject of the Arian Theodoric, the dictator of the religion of the world. Anastasius in his helpless state sought the mediation not of the civil but of the religious sovereign of Italy. He might justly fear Theodoric; himself had once some years before entered into suspicious alliance with Clovis the Frank; he had meditated or threatened a descent on the coast of Italy. The Emperor addressed a letter to Hormisdas, the fame of whose mild disposition tempted him to renew a correspondence broken off by the harshness of former Popes. But Hormisdas, while he warmly approved the Emperor's disposition to peace and unity, declined this flattery at the expense of his predecessors. Yet, on the whole, the language of the Pope's reply was moderate, neither dissembling nor asserting in too haughty terms the pretensions of his See. The proposed Council of Heraclea came to nothing; a Council in the East, under present circumstances, suited the policy neither of the Pope, nor of the Emperor.ⁿ Four ambassadors, the Bishops Ennodius and Fortunatus, the Presbyter Venantius, with Vitalis, a deacon, set forth in the name of Pope

Pope Hormisdas.

A.D. 509.

July 8, 515.

^m Hormisdas, Pope from July, 514, ^{Proceedings,} is altogether inconsistent with to Aug. 6, 523. ^{the whole course of events, as appears}

ⁿ The story in Theophanes as to the perfidy of Anastasius in these pro- ^{from existing documents.}

Hormisdas to Constantinople. Their instructions are extant, a remarkable manual of ecclesiastical <sup>Papal Em-
bassy to Con-
stantinople.</sup> diplomacy in a nice and difficult affair. In the questionable and divided state of the Eastern clergy, especially of Constantinople, as to orthodoxy, the ambassadors were to receive their personal advances with decent courtesy, lest the episcopal character should be lowered in the estimation of the laity; but to avoid all intercourse with men, who might at least be heretics; to receive no presents, not even provisions, only means of conveyance; to incur no obligations, and to decline all invitations to feasts, until they could all meet together at the great feast of the Holy Eucharist. In Constantinople they were to go at once to the lodgings provided by the Emperor, but to avoid all intercourse with their own partisans, till they had presented their credentials to the Emperor.* Besides these credentials they were armed* with letters to Vitalianus, letters however so cautiously worded, that they might acknowledge the possession of them, and though steadily declining to surrender them to the Emperor, might permit them to be read to Vitalianus in the presence of an imperial commissioner. Their instructions, how they were to fix the wavering Emperor, and extort concession after concession, are marked with the same subtle and dexterous policy. They were to demand, I., his unequivocal assent to the Council of Chalcedon, and to the letters of Pope Leo. If he yielded this point, they were to express their

* There was a preliminary caution that, as it was customary in Constantinople for all persons admitted to the emperor on ecclesiastical business to be presented by the bishop, they were to omit, if possible, receiving this courtesy from Timotheus, and if he should officiously thrust himself in the way, and enforce the right of presentation, to declare that they were directly accredited to the emperor alone.

gratitude and kiss his breast, and then, II., to require him to demand the same assent from all the clergy of the East. If he should assert the general orthodoxy of the clergy, and their disposition to quiet submission, had not affairs been thrown into confusion by certain unadvised letters of Pope Symmachus, they were to declare that those letters, now in their hands, contained only general exhortations to accept the Council of Chalcedon. They were to press this point with prayers and tears, to remind the Emperor of God, and of the day of judgement. Should the Emperor reply, "What would you have? I receive the Council of Chalcedon, and the letters of Leo:" they were to elude any assent to this protest, unless he would issue his imperial letters *compelling* a general union with the Church of Rome. Should the Emperor say, "Will you then receive the Bishop of Constantinople into communion?" Here was the nicest point of all, to avoid the recognition of either of the contending prelates, and so to bring the absolute nomination of the Bishop of Constantinople under the cognisance of the proposed Council, over which Council was to preside the representative of Rome. The instructions even anticipate a dangerous objection, which might occur to Anastasius, that the rival prelate, Macedonius, was a notorious heretic. This, they were to rejoin, is a question to be calmly considered when the Church is restored to unity. "What, should the Emperor say, is my city to be without a bishop?" "The canons," they are to answer, "provide remedies for such a difficulty." But these inexorable terms were not all. Anastasius was not only to be compelled to be a persecutor. Besides the acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Leonine letters by the Emperor, and the compulsory enforcement of obedience from the clergy, were

demanded from the Emperor, as to be ratified by the Council. III. The public anathema of Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, and also of their followers, (the maintainers of the Henoticon,) Timotheus Ailurus, Peter of Alexandria, Acacius, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, and Peter of Antioch. IV. The immediate recall from exile of all ecclesiastics in communion with Rome, the causes of their respective banishments to be examined by the Apostolic See. V. The judgement of those accused of persecuting the Catholics to be in like manner submitted to the court of Rome. On the full acceptance of these terms, Hormisdas consented to honour the future Council with his personal presence, not to deliberate but to ratify his own solemn determinations.

But Anastasius was not reduced so low as to submit to these debasing conditions. The condemnation of Acacius was unpopular at Constantinople, the memory of the Bishop dear and sacred to a large party. Anastasius chose this point of resistance. He accepted on his own part the Council of Chalcedon, but why should the living be kept excommunicated from the Church on account of the dead? The terms of Hormisdas could not be enforced without much bloodshed.^p

A.D. 507.

The embassy returned to Rome. Anastasius continued to temporise. An imperial embassy appeared in Rome, accredited to the Senate as well as to the Pope. It entreated the intervention of that venerable body with the glorious Theodoric to unite the afflicted Christian Church and Empire. Hormisdas treated these lay ambassadors, who presumed to interfere in ecclesias-

^p "Grave esse clementia nostra effusione sanguinis scimus posse ea, judicat de ecclesiâ venerabili propter quæ super hoc scribitis, ordinari."—*mortuos vivos expelli, nec sine multâ* Epist. Anast. Labbe, p. 1432.

tical affairs, with supercilious contempt. The churches of Illyria, of which the opinions had as yet hung in doubt, had now given their unqualified adhesion to Hormisdas and the Council of Chalcedon. Far from retracting, he rose in his demands; he condescended indeed to send a second legation, Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, and Peregrius, Bishop of Misenum, to Constantinople. His answer by them was a vehement and implacable invective against the memory of Acacius.^a That bishop's communion with the followers of Dioscorus and of Eutyches infected him with their most heinous guilt. All who hated those heretics, must hate Acacius. The crime of Acacius was darker than that of the original authors of the heresy. The condemnation of Acacius, the unpardonable Acacius—Acacius who had claimed equality with the Pope—was now the only obstacle to the peace between Eastern and Western Christendom, a consummation to which the West, even the remotest Gaul (so wrote Hormisdas, alluding to the Catholic Franks) looked forward with eager interest. Anastasius was now more secure upon his throne, his formidable subject, Vitalianus, had lost his power. To his honour, he would not abandon even the memory of Acacius, who had been guilty only of firmly carrying out the Emperor's scheme of toleration; he broke off all further communication with the merciless Prelate. "We may submit to insult, we may endure that our decrees be annulled, but we will not be commanded." Hormisdas must await the accession of a new Emperor, Justin, before the Churches of Rome and Byzantium are reunited by the sacrifice of him, who besides his communion with Eutychians, had dared to equal himself with the successor of St. Peter."

^a *Epistola Hormisdæ apud Labbe.*

[†] *Epist. Anastas Labbe p. 1460.*

But with the age and decay of Anastasius the strength of the Chalcedonian party increased rapidly. Timotheus, the Bishop of Constantinople, gave hopes at least, that he would secure himself by timely concession. Hormisdas addressed encouraging letters to the Catholic bishops, and though Anastasius ventured to punish with severity certain monks who strove to stir up rebellion, he dared not to resent this treasonable correspondence with his subjects. The monks in Syria, of that party, appealed from the Emperor, whom they accused of contemptuously rejecting their humble supplications for protection and redress against their rivals, charged with the massacre of their brethren in the church, to the representative of St. Peter and St. Paul.^a

The strife ended with the death, if we are to believe Baronius, the damnation of Anastasius. The death of an old man, at least eighty-one, more likely eighty-eight years of age, was ascribed to the visible vengeance of God. There was a terrible tempest, and that tempest transported away the affrighted soul of the Emperor, or struck him dead by its lightning. His death was revealed to a saint at a great distance, who communicated the awful fact to three of his brethren, intimating at the same time that he himself was summoned to appear before the tribunal of God within ten days, to bear witness against the Emperor.^b This Elias departed before the end of ten days on his charitable errand, so necessary to enlighten Omniscience as to the deeds of a mortal man. So deeply had the passion of hatred, offering itself to the heart in the garb of religious zeal, infected the Christian mind, that Cardinal Baronius, reviving the inexorable

^a *Relatio Archimandritæ et Monach. Syriæ apud Labbe, 1461.*

^b *Baronius, sub ann. 518, with his authorities.*

resentment which had slept for centuries, calls upon the Church to sing a hymn of rejoicing over this new Pharaoh, this Emperor, thus, for his resistance to the Pope, judged, damned, and thrust down into hell.

Justin, a rude unlettered Dacian peasant, seized the throne of Constantinople; and there was an instantaneous religious revolution in the Byzantine court and city, and throughout the East. Justin, though ignorant, was known to be of unbending orthodoxy. Only six days after his proclamation, the Emperor, with his wife Lupicina, who had been his slave and concubine, and who took the more decorous name of Euphemia, entered the great church. The populace broke out in acclamations, "Long life to the new Constantine and the new Helena." Their clamours ceased not with these loyal expressions: "Away with the Manicheans, proclaim the Council of Chalcedon." They demanded the degradation of Severus of Antioch, immediate reconciliation with Rome, and even that the bones of the Manicheans (the Emperor Anastasius and his party) should be torn up from their sepulchres. John of Cappadocia, the patriarch of Constantinople, a man of servile mind, though unmeasured ambition, had acquiesced without remonstrance in all the measures of Anastasius. He now ascended the pulpit, declared his adhesion to the four great Councils, especially that of Chalcedon. The populace summoned him to utter his anathema against Severus; the Prelate obeyed. The next day was celebrated a festival in honour of the Council of Chalcedon. John of Cappadocia hastily assembled a Council of forty bishops, which confirmed all the demands of the rabble; Justin ratified their decrees by an imperial edict, commanding the recall of all the exiled bishops, and the expulsion of those who

Accession of
Justin.

July 9, 518.

July 15.

had usurped their sees. A second edict disqualified all heretics from holding civil or military office. The whole East followed the example of the capital, and became orthodox with the orthodox Emperor. Heraclea, Nicæa, Nicomedia, Gangra, Jerusalem, Ptolemais, Tyre, restored the Chalcedonian bishops. Antioch shook off ^{Close of the schism} the yoke of Severus. Thessalonica and Alexandria alone made resistance, but were awed into submission. The death of the Eunuch Amantius, who had aspired to dispose of the empire, which he could not usurp himself; by whose gold, entrusted to him for other purposes, Justin had bought the crown; had been demanded as a sacrifice by the populace, and was readily conceded by Justin, his treason being aggravated by his notorious Manicheism. Theocritus, whom he had intended to raise to the empire, shared his unpopularity and his doom. But Vitalianus, the pillar of orthodoxy, met no better fate; he was treacherously invited to Constantinople, promoted to the highest dignity, and in the seventh month of his consulate assassinated by the agents of Justinian, the Emperor's nephew, now clearing the way for his own accession to the throne. Even before these necessary precautions for the security of his reign, the zealous Emperor had opened negotiations with Rome." All opposition shrunk away. Hormisdas had the satisfaction not merely of compelling, by the aid of the Emperor, the whole East to accept his theologic doctrines, but his anathemas also of the living and of the dead. At the demand of his legates, the names of Acacius, and all who communicated with him, those of the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius, were erased from the diptychs. John the Patriarch vainly struggled to

1 The first letter of Justin was dated August 1; the second, September 7.

save the blameless names of Euphemius and Macedonius[†] from the same ignominy: they were included with the rest (they were severely orthodox, but they had been guilty of acknowledging Acacius and his successor as legitimate patriarchs);[‡] yet, nevertheless, the East has continued to reverence them as of undoubted orthodoxy. John however contrived a happy expedient to elude the direct recognition of the supremacy of Rome, by declaring that the Churches of old and new Rome were one.

March 28,
A.D. 519.

He assumed, by the permission of Justin, the yet pregnant title of œcumenic Patriarch. So closed the schism which had lasted for thirty-five years. Latin and Greek Christianity held again one creed. East and West were at peace.

Theodoric had stood aloof, whether in contemptuous indifference, or, as he might suppose, intent on nobler objects, from all these intrigues, embassies and negotiations. He left his subject, the Bishop of Rome, to assert, as he might, his ecclesiastical superiority over Constantinople; to league with the rebellious subjects of Byzantium against the eastern Emperor; to treat with Justin almost as an independent sovereign. Theodoric was now at the height of his fame and power, his kingdom of its peace and felicity. His dominion extended without rival, without opposition, from the Alps to Calabria. His sovereignty extended over the ancient provinces of Noricum and Pannonia, and some large adjacent, if not distinctly bounded territories; over the whole south of France, and even parts of Spain. But not all the victories, not all the virtues, not the wisdom, justice, and moderation of Theodoric, nor the prosperity of Italy under his rule, could secure his repose,

[†] Compare Walch, vii. p. 109.

or enable him to close his reign without strife, injustice, persecution, and bloodshed. His firm character might overawe the elements of civil dissension, the jealousy of the two races which formed his subjects, and the feeble impatience of Rome under the barbarian sway. It was religious strife which broke up the quiet of his life and reign, and perhaps, by embittering his temper in the decline of his days, by awakening suspicions not altogether groundless, and fears not without warrant, led to the crimes which have so deeply sullied his memory, the death of Boethius and of Symmachus. Notwithstanding the natural repugnance of the Romans to a foreign sway, and the secret dissatisfaction with which the Emperor of the East must have beheld the West altogether severed from the Roman Empire, yet Theodoric the Goth might have lived and ruled, and transmitted his sceptre in peace to his posterity; but an orthodox empire would not repose in unreluctant submission under an Arian. It was the unity of the Church, upon the accession of Justin, which endangered his government. Heresy, at the head of a prosperous kingdom, and a powerful fleet and army in the West, had commanded respect, so long as Eutychianism, or the no less odious compulsory toleration of the Henoticon, sat on the throne of Constantinople. Catholicism had concentrated all its hatred on the Manicheans, as they were called, who refused the Council of Chalcedon; but no sooner were those dissensions healed, than it began to resent, to look with holy jealousy upon, and to burn with fiery zeal against the older heterodoxy; it would no longer brook the equality of the detested Arians.

The first aggression was confined to the East. Justin in a terrible edict commanded all Manicheans A.D. 524. to leave the empire on pain of death; all other

heretics, who were ranked with pagans and Jews, were incapacitated for all civil and military offices, excepting the Goths, and other foreign soldiers in the service of the empire.* The exception might seem intended to lull the jealousy of Theodoric; yet the Arians of the East could not but see that this, hard measure as it was, was only the beginning of the persecution; they looked to the Sovereign of Italy for protection, for the continued possession of that tacit exemption which they had long enjoyed from the intolerant rigour in force against other heretics. It was precisely at this juncture that rumours were spread abroad of dangerous speeches—at least concerning their independence of the Gothic yoke, the assertion of the liberties of Rome—having been ventured in the capital. Vague intelligence reached Ravenna, of an actual and wide-spread conspiracy which involved the whole Senate; but of which Albinus, the most distinguished Rumours of conspiracies. of the Roman patricians, was the head. Indignation, not without apprehension, at this sudden, and, as it appeared, simultaneous movement of hostility, seized the soul of Theodoric. The whole circumstances of his position demand careful consideration. Nothing could be more unprovoked than the religious measures of Constantinople, as far as they menaced the West, or assailed the kindred of Theodoric in the East or even those who held the same faith. His equity to his Catholic and Arian subjects was unimpeachable; to the Pope he had always shown respectful deference; he had taken no advantage of the contention for the Pontificate to promote his own tenets. Even as late as this very year, he had bestowed on the Church

A.D. 523. Of
Theodoric's
reign 31.

* Theophanes. Cedrenus in loc.

of St. Peter two magnificent chandeliers of solid silver. But the Catholics resented, no doubt, the unshaken justice with which Theodoric had protected the Jews.⁷ At Rome, at Milan, and at Genoa the Jews had been attacked by the irrepressible hostility of the Catholics: their synagogues had been burned or destroyed, or their property unjustly seized. Theodoric compelled the restoration of the synagogues at the public expense. The Catholics had taken the pretext of the demolition of a small chapel dedicated to St. Stephen at Verona, probably for the fortification or embellishment of the city, as another indication of aggression on the part of Theodoric.⁸ These were slight but significant signs of the growing hostility. Nor was it in the East alone that Catholicism menaced the life of Arianism. The Council of Epaona, in Burgundian Gaul, at which bishops from the territories of Theodoric had met, had passed severe canons closing the churches of the Arians.

Though Clovis was now dead, orthodoxy was still the battle-cry of the Franks; in all the Gothic kingdoms the government might dread the prayers, if not the more active interference of the Catholic clergy on the side of their enemies.

It was in connexion with the bad feeling, which caused and was no doubt aggravated by the demolition of the chapel in Verona, that Theodoric took the strong measure of totally disarming the Roman population. He prohibited them from bearing any offensive weapons; the only instrument permitted was a small knife for the common purposes of life.

⁷ Hist. of the Jews, v. iii. p. 56.

⁸ Gibbon supposes that Theodoric may have been anathematised from the pulpit of that chapel.

No less doubtful and menacing was the aspect of civil affairs. The heir of Theodoric was a child. State of Theodoric's family. His gallant son-in-law Eutharis, the hopeful successor to his valour, his wisdom, as well as his religious opinions, was now dead. Notwithstanding all her virtues and her accomplishments, Amalasuntha, his only daughter, as a female could hardly cope with the difficulties of the times, sole guardian of a boy-king. Theodoric knew that the Emperor of the East in his pride still considered the barbarian king as his vassal, as originally holding Italy by his grant, and so, no doubt, claimed the power of revoking that grant. The Goths might be safe from hostile aggression, so long as the aged Justin, who was sixty-eight years old at his accession, occupied the throne : but he could not be ignorant of the character, the unmeasured and unscrupulous ambition, the unbending orthodoxy of Justinian. Theodoric's prophetic sagacity might well anticipate the events which in a few years would not merely endanger, but extinguish the Italian kingdom of the Goths.

It was at this juncture, when the Emperor of the East might be at least suspected of designs, if he had not committed overt acts, in order to recover and reunite the severed empire ; when he might seem to be enlisting all the religious and all the Roman sympathies of Theodoric's subjects in a kind of initiatory treason, in a deep, if yet silent and inactive dissatisfaction, that these dark rumours began to spread of secret intelligence between the Senate of Rome and the East. Men, it is asserted by Boethius himself, of infamous character, yet who had held, and who afterwards held high offices of trust and honour, accused Albinus, the chief of the Senate, of disloyal correspondence with Constantinople.

Albinus was the friend of Boethius. Boethius the

senator the patrician, the descendant and head of the noble Anician family, who connected himself with the old republic by the name of ^{Boethius.} Manlius; the philosopher, the theologian, the consummate master of all the arts and sciences known at that period—had been raised to the highest civil honour; not only had he himself received the ensigns of the Consulate, but the father had seen his two sons in the same year raised to that honour, which still maintained its traditionary grandeur in the Roman mind. On the day of their inauguration, Boethius, too, pronounced a panegyric on his munificent Gothic sovereign, and displayed his own magnificence by distributing a noble largess to the people at the games. In his public capacity Boethius had declared himself the protector of the Romans against the oppressions of Theodoric's ministers. He had repressed the extortions of Cunegast, the more violent tyranny of Treguella the chamberlain of Theodoric's household—(these names betray their Gothic origin). By a dangerous exercise of his authority he had rescued many unfortunate persons from the rapacity of the barbarians; he had saved the fortunes of many other provincials from private exaction, and from unjust and inordinate taxation. He had opposed the Prætorian Prefect in certain measures, by which a famine in Campania would have been greatly aggravated; on this act he had received the public approbation of the King. He had plucked Paulinus, a man of senatorial rank, from the very jaws of those hounds of the palace, who had already in hope devoured his confiscated estate. Such, according to Boethius himself, were his merits towards his own countrymen, the causes of the hostility towards him among the Gothic courtiers of Theodoric. And even under the rigid equity of Theodoric, such

abuses might be almost inevitable in that form of society. Boethius hastened to Verona to confront the accuser Cyprianus, the great referendary, when he heard the accusation of treason against Albinus,^a and in the face of the Emperor declared, "If Albinus is criminal, I and the whole Senate are equally guilty." The generous boldness of Boethius awoke no admiration or sympathy in the heart of Theodoric. Instead of saving his friend, Boethius was involved in his ruin. Three persons, one of whom, Basilius (according to Boethius) had been dismissed ignominiously from the royal service, and whom poverty drove to any crime; two others, Opilio and Gaudentius, who had been exiled, had taken refuge in the sanctuary of a church, and had been threatened, if they should not leave Ravenna in a certain number of days, with branding in the forehead, were admitted as witnesses against Boethius. He was accused of more than hoping for the freedom of Rome. His signature, forged as he declared, was shown at the foot of an address, inviting the Emperor of the East to reconquer Italy.^b Boethius was refused permission to examine the informers. He admits the latent, but glorious treason of his heart. "Had there been any hopes of liberty, I should have freely indulged them. Had I known of a conspiracy against the King, I should have answered in the words of a noble Roman to the frantic Caligula, you would not

^a Gibbon says that Albinus was only accused of *hoping* the liberty of Rome. The Anonym. Vales. declares the charge to have been of treasonable correspondence with the East.

^b The specific charges against Boethius were that he had endeavoured to maintain inviolate the authority of the senate; that he had prevented an informer from forwarding certain documents inculcating the senate to the king; that he had been privy and assenting to an address from the senate to the Emperor of the East.

have known it from me." The King, now, in the words of Boethius, eager to involve the whole Senate in one common ruin,^c condemned Boethius to imprisonment. He was incarcerated in Calvenzano, a castle between Milan and Pavia.^d

In the mean time the religious affairs of the East became more threatening to the kinsmen, and to those who held the same religious creed with Theodoric. The correspondence between the monarchs had produced no effect. Theodoric had written in these words to Justin:—"To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God; by the nature of things the power of sovereigns is confined to political government; they have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace;^e the most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief." Golden words! but mistimed above twelve hundred years.

Correspondence between East and West.

Justin coolly answered, that he pretended to no authority over men's consciences, but it was his prerogative to entrust the public offices to those in whom he had confidence; and public order demanding uniformity of worship, he had full right to command the

^c Avidus communis exitu.

^d The narrative of these events is perplexed by making, as many writers (following the Anonym. Vales.) have done, the death of Boethius immediately consequent upon his imprisonment. But he had time during that imprisonment to write the *De Consolat. Philosophiæ*.

^e Cassiod. ii. 6, iii. 28. Le Beau (*Hist. du Bas Empire*, T. viii. p. 68)

cites this correspondence between Theodoric and Justin. I have a strong impression that at the time (my invariable practice) I verified the quotation. But I cannot now find it, nor do the references of Le Beau, in general a dry, accurate, un inventive writer, lead to it. That these were the sentiments of Theodoric and Justin might be made out, but I cannot now *aven* the strict accuracy of the words.

churches to be open to those alone who should conform to the religion of the state. The Arians of the East were thus stripped of all offices of honour or emolument, were not only expelled from the Catholic churches, but their own were closed against them, and they were exposed to all the insults, vexations, and persecutions of their adversaries, who were not likely to enjoy their triumph with moderation, or to repress their conscientiously intolerant zeal. Great numbers who held but loosely to their faith, conformed to the state religion; the more sincere appealed in the strongest terms to the protection of Theodoric. The King of Italy at first maintained something of his usual calm moderation; he declined all retaliation, to which he had been incessantly urged, on the orthodox of the West. He determined on an embassy to Constantinople to enforce upon the Eastern Emperor the wisdom of mutual toleration; the ambassador whom he selected for this mission of peace was the Pope himself, not the vigorous Hormisdas, but John I. who had quietly succeeded to the See of Rome on the death of that Prelate.^f This extraordinary measure shows either an overweening reliance in Theodoric on his own power, or a confidence magnanimous, but equally unaccountable, a confidence bordering on simplicity, that for his own uninterrupted exercise of justice, humanity, and moderation he had a right to expect the return of fidelity and gratitude. Could he fondly suppose that the loyalty of the Pope would be proof against the blandishments of the Eastern court, that the Bishop of Rome would be zealous in a cause so directly at issue with his own principles? The Pope, summoned to

Theodoric
sends Pope
John to Con-
stantinople

^f John, Pope, August 13, A.D. 523.

Ravenna, was instructed to demand of Justin the re-opening of their churches to the Arians, perfect toleration, and the restoration to their former faith of those who on compulsion had conformed to the Catholic religion.^a To the Pope's remonstrances and attempts to limit his mediatorial office, to points less unsuited to his character, Theodoric angrily replied, by commanding the envoys instantly to embark on the vessels which were ready for the voyage.^b The Pope, attended by five other bishops and four senators, set forth on a mission of which it was the ostensible object to obtain indulgence for heretics, heretics under the ban of his Church, heretics looked upon with the most profound detestation.

Hitherto the Pope had remained in his unmoved and stately dignity within his own city. Excepting in the case of the exiled Liberius, he had hardly ventured further than the court of Ravenna, or on such a service as that of Leo to the camp of Attila. The Pope had not even attended any of the great Councils. Aware, as it might almost seem, that much of the awe which attached to his office, arose from the seat of his authority, he had but rarely departed from the chair of St. Peter; and but recently Hormisdas had demanded the unconditional submission of the Emperor of Constantinople to his decrees, as the price of his promised condescension to appear at a Council in that city.

The Pope was received in Constantinople with the most flattering honours, as though he had been St. Peter himself. The whole city, with the Emperor at its head, came forth to meet him with tapers

^a This seems the meaning of the sentence in the Anonym. Vales. "ut restituant religionem."—p. 626.

^b Their names in the Anonym Vales.

Pope John
in Constantinople

and torches, as far as ten miles beyond the gates. The Emperor knelt at his feet and implored his benediction. On Easter day he performed the service in the great Church, Epiphanius the Bishop ceding the first place to the more holy stranger. It was hinted in the West that the Pope had placed the crown on the head of Justin. But of the course and the success of his negotiations all is utterly confused and contradictory. By one account, now abandoned as a later forgery, he boldly confirmed the Emperor in the rejection of all concessions, and himself consecrated all the Arian Churches for Catholic worship.¹ By another, he was so far faithful to his mission, as to obtain liberty of worship, and the restitution of their Churches to the Arians. The Emperor refused only the restoration of those Arians who had embraced the Catholic faith.²

Imprison-
ment and
death of
John
May 18, 526.

All that is certainly known is, that John the Pope on his return was received as a traitor by Theodoric, thrown into prison, and there the highest ecclesiastic of the West languished for nearly a year, and died.

But before his return, the deep and wide-spread conspiracy, which Theodoric had discovered, or supposed that he had discovered, led to the death of a far greater man, Boethius, and subsequently to that of the virtuous father-in-law of Boethius, the Senator Symmachus.

Boethius's
Consolation of
Philosophy

Boethius had lightened the hours in his dreary confinement by the composition of his famous book, the Consolation of Philosophy, the closing work of Roman literature. Intellectually, Boethius was the last of the Romans, and Roman letters may be said to

¹ Baronius rested this on a supposititious letter of Isidorus Mercator; ² Anonym. Vales. p. 627. Histor. this letter is expided by Pagi, sub Miscell. apud Muratori

have expired with greater dignity in his person, than the Empire in that of Augustulus. His own age might justly wonder at the universal accomplishments of Boethius. Theodoric himself, writing by the hand, and no doubt in the pedantic language of his minister Cassiodorus, had paid homage to his knowledge. "Through him Pythagoras the musician, Ptolemy the astronomer, Nicomachus the arithmetician, Euclid the geometer, Plato the theologian, Aristotle the logician, Archimedes the mechanician, had learned to speak the Roman language." Boethius had mingled in theologic controversy, had discussed the mysterious question of the Trinity without any suspicion of heresy, and steered safely along the narrow strait between Nestorianism and Eutychianism. He is even said, for a time, to have withdrawn to the monastic solitudes, and to have held religious intercourse with Benedict of Nursia, and his followers. All this constitutes the extraordinary, the peculiar character of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, which appears as the last work of Roman letters, rather than as eminent among Christian writings. It is equally surprising that in such an age and by such a man, in his imprisonment and under the terrors of approaching death, *Consolation* should be found in *Philosophy* rather than in *Religion*; that he should have sought his examples of patience in Socrates with his hemlock cup, or among the arguments of the Garden or the Porch, rather than in the Gospel or the Legends of Christian martyrdom. From the beginning of the book to the end, there is nothing distinctly Christian; its religion is no higher than Theism; almost the whole might have been written by Cicero in exile, or by Marcus Antoninus under some reverse of fortune. The long and enduring popularity of the *Consolation of Philosophy* during the

dark ages completes the singular and anomalous character of the work itself.

This all-accomplished, all-honoured man was not only torn away from his library, inlaid with ivory and glass, from the enjoyment of ample wealth and as ample honour, from the esteem of his friends and the love of his family, left to pine in a remote and lonely prison, and then released by the public executioner—the manner of his death, if we are to trust our authorities, was peculiarly inhuman. He was first tortured, a cord was tightly twisted round his forehead, whether or not to extort confession of his suspected treason; and he was then beaten to death with a club.^m

Nor was the vengeance of Theodoric satiated with the blood of Boethius. Theodoric, dreading the influence of Symmachus, the head of the Senate, a man of the highest virtues; and suspecting, lest, in his indignation at the death of his son-in-law, he should engage or had engaged in some desperate plot against the Gothic kingdom, summoned him to Ravenna, where his head was struck off by the executioner.ⁿ This was followed by the imprisonment of Pope John, and his death. Throughout these melancholy scenes, the historian is reduced to a sad alternative. He must either suppose that the clear intellect and generous character of Theodoric had become enfeebled by age; his temper soured by the sudden and harassing anxieties, which seemed to break so unseasonably on the peace of his declining years, and the ingratitude of his Roman subjects for above thirty years of mild and equitable rule; those subjects now would scarcely await his death

Death of
Boethius.

Symmachus.

May 18, 526.

to attempt to throw off the yoke, and would inevitably league with the East against his infant heir. Theodoric, therefore, blinded by unworthy suspicions, yielded himself up to the basest informers, and closed a reign of justice and humanity, with a succession of acts, cruel, sanguinary, and wantonly revengeful. Or on the other hand, he must conclude, that notwithstanding his protestations of innocence, Boethius and his friends, dazzled by patriotic visions of the restoration of the Roman power, or, what is less likely, considering the philosophic tone of his religion, by orthodox zeal, had tampered at least with the enemies of the existing government; and that the Roman Senate looked forward in more than quiet prophetic hope, in actual traitorous correspondence to that invasion from the East, which took place not many years after the death of Theodoric. Both views are perhaps true. Theodoric was a father, a Goth. Kings discriminate not between the aspirations of their subjects for revolt, and actual plans for revolt; they are bound to be far-sighted; their vision becomes more jealously acute, the more remote and indistinct the objects; treason in men's hearts becomes treason in act. On the other hand, insolent Roman vanity, stern religious zeal, were not likely to be coldly, timorously prudent; desires, hopes would find words; words eager hearers, hearers become informers; and informers are not too faithful reporters. Goths, Arians, courtiers, might, even with no dishonest or sinister intent, hear conspiracy in every boast of Roman freedom, in every reminiscence of Roman pride.

Theodoric was now in his 74th year; almost the last act of his reign was the nomination of the successor of John. His interposition was enforced by the fierce contentions which followed the death of that prelate.

His choice fell on Felix, a Samnite, a learned and a blameless man. But the clergy and the people, who were agitated with strife, threatening the peace of the city and a renewal of the bloody scenes at the election of Laurentius and Symmachus, united in stern resistance to the nomination, in which they had been allowed no voice.^o Theodoric in his calm wisdom came to an agreement to regulate future elections—an agreement, which in theory subsisted, till the election of the Pope was transferred to the College of Cardinals. The Pope was to be chosen by the free suffrages of the clergy and people, but might not assume his office till confirmed by the sovereign. For his confirmation the Pope made a certain payment to be distributed among the poor. On this understanding the clergy and the city acquiesced in the nomination of Pope Felix.^p

Theodoric died in the month following the peaceful accession of Felix to the Pontifical throne.
Death of Theodoric. Aug. 526. The glory of his reign passed from the memory of man with the peace and prosperity of Italy. But the hatred of his heretical opinions survived the remembrance of his virtues. He is said to have committed to a Jew, named Symmachus Scolasticus, the framing of an edict, for the expulsion of the Catholics from all their churches;^q a statement utterly irreconcilable with his judicious and conciliatory conduct on

^o Cassiod. Var. viii. 15. This nomination was absolute. Athalaric writes thus: "Oportebat enim arbitrio boni principis (Theodorici) obediri, qui sapienti deliberatione pertractans, quamvis in alienâ religione, talem visus est pontificem delegisse, ut nulli merito debeat displicere. . . . Rece-

pistus itaque virum, et divinâ gratiâ probabiliter institutum, et regali examinatione laudatum."

^p He took quiet possession of the throne July 12, 526.

^q Anonym. Vales.; Agnell. in Vit. Pontific. Ravennat.

the election of the Pope. Theodoric, it was observed, died by the same disease which smote the heresiarch Arius in the hour of his triumph. The Greek historian of the Gothic war, who may be taken as representing the Byzantine aversion to the memory of Theodoric, has described him as dying in a terrific agony of remorse at his own crimes. A large fish was placed before Theodoric at his supper. The King beheld in it the gory head of Symmachus, with the teeth set and gnawing the lower lip, and the eyes rolling in a fierce frenzy, and sternly menacing his murderer. Theodoric, shivering with cold, rushed to his chamber; he called for more clothes to be heaped upon his bed, but nothing could restore the warmth of life; he sent for his physician, and bitterly, and in an agony of tears, reproached himself with the death of Symmachus and of Boethius.^r He died a few days after; and even Procopius adds, that these were the first and the last acts of injustice committed by Theodoric against his subjects. But later visionaries did not the less pursue his soul to its eternal condemnation; he was seen by a hermit hurled by the ministers of the divine retribution into the volcano of Lipari: volcanoes in those days were believed to be the openings to hell.^s

Ravenna still, among the later works of Justinian and the Byzantine Exarchs, preserves some memorials of the magnificence of Theodoric. Of his stately palace remain but some crumbling and disfigured walls. Byzantine art has taken possession of his churches; Justinian and Theodora still dimly blaze in the gold and purple of the mosaics.^t The monument of Theodoric,

^r Procop. de bello Gothico, i. pp. 11, 12. this work, see hereafter.

^s If we may trust a passage in Gregor. i. Dialog. iv. 36. On Agnelli (Vit. Pontific. Ravenn. apud

perhaps the oldest work of Christian art, is still entire, marking some tendency to that transition from the Roman grandeur of bold and massy arches to the multiplicity of mediæval details. Yet in these remains nothing can be traced which realises those singular expressions of Cassiodorus, so prophetic it might seem of what was afterwards characteristic of the so-called Gothic architecture—the tall, slender, reed-like pillars, the lofty roof supported, as it were, by clustered lances.^u

Muratori, iii. p. 95), the church of San Vitale, erected in a city the capital of an Arian sovereign, was unequalled in its splendour, we presume in the West. It cost 26,000 golden solidi. Taking the golden solidus (ac-

nomie Politt. des Romains, i. p. 46) at 15 francs 10 c., about 12s. 6d., between 15,000*l.* and 16,000*l.*

▪ “Quid dicimus columnarum junctam procentatam. . . . Erectis hastilibus contineri moles illas sublimissimas fabricarum.”—Cassiod. viii. 12

CHAPTER IV.

Justinian.

HISTORY scarcely offers a more extraordinary contrast than that between the reign and the character of the Emperor Justinian. Under the nephew, colleague, and heir of Justin, the Roman Empire appears suddenly to resume her ancient majesty and power. The signs of a just, able, and vigorous administration, internal peace, prosperity, conquest, and splendour surround the master of the Roman world. The greatest generals, since the days perhaps of Trajan, Belisarius and Narses appear at the head of the Roman armies. Persia is kept at bay, during several campaigns if not continuously successful, yet honourable to the arms of Rome. The tide of barbarian conquest is rolled back. Africa, the Illyrian and Dalmatian provinces, Sicily, Italy, with the ancient Capital, are again under the empire of Rome; the Vandal kingdom, the Gothic kingdom fall before the irresistible generals of the East. The frontiers of the empire are defended with fortifications, constructed at enormous cost;^a but become necessary now that Roman valour had lost its spell of awe over the human mind; and that the perpetual migrations and movements from the North and the East were continually propelling new and formidable nations

^a Procopius de *Ædificiis*, passim. rest the fortifications and defensive buildings throughout the empire. The first book describes the ecclesiastical buildings of Constantinople; the

against the boundaries of the Roman world. Justinian aspires to be the legislator of mankind; a vast system of jurisprudence embodies the wisdom of ancient and of imperial statutes, mingled with some of the benign influences of Christianity, of which the author might almost have been warranted in the presumptuous vaticination, that it would exercise an unrepealed authority to the latest ages. The cities of the empire are adorned with buildings, civil as well as religious, of great magnificence and apparent durability, which, with the comprehensive legislation, might recall the peaceful days of the Antonines. The empire, at least at first, is restored to religious unity: Catholicism resumes its sway, and Arianism, so long its rival, dies out in remote and neglected congregations. In Spain alone it is the religion of the sovereign.

The creator of this new epoch in Roman greatness, at least he who filled the throne during its creation, the Emperor Justinian, unites in himself the most opposite vices,—insatiable rapacity and lavish prodigality, intense pride and contemptible weakness, unmeasured ambition and dastardly cowardice. He is the uxorious slave of his empress, whom, after she had ministered to the licentious pleasures of the populace as a courtesan, and as an actress, in the most immodest exhibitions (we make due allowance for the malicious exaggerations in the secret history of Procopius), in defiance of decency, of honour, of the remonstrances of his friends, and of religion, he had made the partner of his throne. In the Christian Emperor seem to meet the crimes of those, who won or secured their empire by the assassination of all whom they feared, the passion for public diversions without the accomplishments of Nero or the brute strength of Commodus, the dotage of Claudius.

Constantinople might appear to retrograde to paganism. The peace of the city and even the stability of the empire are endangered not by foreign invasion, not at first by a dangerous rival for the throne, nor even by religious dissensions, but by the factions of the Circus, the partisans of the Blue and of the Green, and the colours worn in the games by the contending charioteers. Justinian himself, during the memorable sedition, the Nike, had nearly abandoned the throne, and fled before a despicable antagonist. "The throne is a glorious sepulchre," exclaimed the prostitute whom he had raised to that throne, and Justinian and the empire are saved by her courage. This imperious woman, even if from exhaustion or lassitude she discontinued, or at least condescended to disguise, those vices which dishonoured her husband, in her cruelties knew no restraint. And these cruelties, exercised in order to gratify her rapacity, if not in sheer caprice, as a substitute for that excitement which had lost its keenness and its zest, are almost more culpable indications of the Emperor's weakness. This meanness of subservience to female influence becomes the habit of the court, and the great Belisarius, like his master, is ruled and disgraced by an insolent and profligate wife. Nor do either of them, in shame, or in conscious want of Christian holiness, stand aloof from the affairs of that religion, whose precepts and whose spirit they thus trample under foot. Theodora, a bigot without faith, a heretic, it might almost be presumed, without religious convictions, by the superior strength of her character, domineers in this as in other respects over the whole court, mingles in all religious intrigues, appoints to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, sells the Papacy itself. Her charities alone (if we except her masculine courage, and

no doubt that great ability which mastered the inferior mind of her husband), if they sprung from lingering womanly tenderness, or that inextinguishable kindness which Christianity sometimes infuses into the hardest hearts, if they were not designed as a deliberate compromise with heaven for her vices and cruelties, may demand our admiration. The feeling which induced the degraded and miserable victim of the lusts and contempt of men to found, perhaps, the first penitentiaries for her sisters in that wretched class, as it shows her superior to the base fear of awakening remembrances of her own former shame, may likewise be considered as an enforced homage to female virtue. Even in Theodora we would discover the very feeblest emotions of Christianity. Justinian aspires too to be the legislator not of the empire alone,^b but of Christendom, enacts ordinances for the whole Church; and unhappily, not content with establishing the doctrines of Nicæa and Chalcedon, as the religion of the Empire, by his three Chapters replunges Christendom into religious strife.

The reign of Justinian, during the period between the death of Theodoric and the conquest of Italy, was occupied by the Persian and African wars, and the commotions arising out of the public games in Constantinople. The only event which commands religious interest is the suppression of the schools in Athens. That last vain struggle of Grecian philosophy against Christianity, which had so signally failed even with an Emperor Julian at its head; that Platonic theism which had endeavoured to

^b I have studied, besides the ordinary authorities, a life of Justinian by Ludewig.—Hal. Sahe. 1731. To the

great lawyer the vices and weaknesses of Justinian are lost in admiration of his jurisprudence.

give new life to paganism, by enlisting the imagination in its service, and establishing a sensible communication with the unseen world; which, in order to command the innate superstition of mankind had allied itself with magic; and which still (its better function) promulgated noble precepts of somewhat dreamy ^{Suppression of Schools at Athens.} morality; was not allowed to expire like a worn-out veteran in peaceful dignity. It was forcibly expelled from the ancient groves and porches of Athens, where recently, under Proclus, it had rallied, as it were, for a last gleam of lustre; it was driven out by the impatient zeal of Justinian. Seven followers of Proclus, it is well known, sought a more hospitable retreat in Persia; but the Magianism of that kingdom was not much more tolerant than the Christianity of the East. Philosophy found no resting-place; and probably few of her disciples could enjoy the malicious consolation which might have been drawn from the manner in which she had long been revenging herself on Christianity by suggesting, quickening with her contentious spirit, and aiding with all her subtleties of language those disputes which had degraded the faith of Jesus from its sublime moral and religious dictatorship over the human mind.

Justinian, when he determined to attempt the reconquest of Africa, might take the high position of the vindicator of the Catholics from long, cruel, and almost unrelenting persecution. The African Catholics had enjoyed a short gleam of peace during the reign of Hilderic, who had deviated into toleration, unknown to the Arianism of the Vandals alone; he had restored about two hundred bishops to their churches. The Catholics might behold with terror the overthrow of the just Hilderic by the stern Gilimer, and might reasonably dread a renewal of the dark days of the great perse-

cutors, of Thrasimund and of Hunneric. The voices of those confessors, who are said to have spoken clearly and distinctly after their tongues had been cut out down to the root; who might be heard to speak publicly (for one of them was a deacon) by the curious or the devout in Constantinople itself, might excite the compassion and animate the zeal of Justinian.^c The frugal John

^c This is the one post-apostolic miracle which appears to rest on the strongest evidence. If we are to trust Victor Vitensis, we cannot take refuge in the notion that then speech was imperfect. Of one at least, the Deacon Reparatus, he asserts that he spoke both clearly and distinctly. The words of Procopius are ἀκραιφνῆ τῇ φωνῇ. If we listen to Æneas of Gaza, it is equally impossible to recur to the haste, or slovenly execution of the punishment by the barbarian executioner. He states, from his own ocular inspection, that the tongue had been torn away by the roots.—Victor Vitens. v. 6; Rumart, p. 483, 487; Æneas Gazensis in Theophrasto in Biblioth. Patr. viii. p. 364, 665; Justinian, codex i. tit. xxvii.; Marcellin in Chronic. Procop. de Bell. Vandal. i. 7, p. 385; Gregor. Magn. Dialog. iii. 32. The question is, the credibility of such witnesses in such an age. A recent traveller has furnished a curious illustration of this one post-apostolic miracle which puzzled Gibbon. The writer is describing Djazzar Pasha's cruelties:—"Each Emir was held down in a squatting position, with his hands tied behind him, and his face turned upwards. The officiating tefeketchy now approached his victim; and standing over him, as if

about to extract a tooth, forced open his mouth, and, darting a hook through the top of the tongue, pulled it out until the root was exposed: one or two passes of a razor sufficed to cut it out. It is a curious fact, however, that the tongues grew again sufficient for the purposes of speech."—Colonel Churchill's Lebanon, vol. iii. p. 384. A friend has suggested this more extraordinary passage:—"Zal Khan (condemned by Aga Mohammed Khan to lose his eyes) loaded the tyrant with curses. 'Cut out his tongue' was the second order. This mandate was imperfectly executed; and the loss of half this member deprived him of speech. Being afterwards persuaded that its being cut close to the root would enable him to speak so as to be understood, he submitted to the operation, and the effect has been, that his voice, though indistinct and thick, is yet intelligible to persons accustomed to converse with him. *This I experienced from daily intercourse.* He often spoke to me of his sufferings. . . ." Sir John Malcolm adds, that he is "ignorant of anatomy, . . . but the facts are as stated, and I had them from the very best authority, old Zal Khan himself."—Sketches of Persia, ii. p. 116. This mutilation, in fact, is common in the East. I have

of Cappadocia, the minister of Justinian, remonstrated against an expedition so costly and so uncertain in its event as the invasion of Africa. His apprehensions seem justified by the disastrous and ignominious failure of that under Basiliscus. But John was silenced by a devout bishop. The holy man had seen a vision, which commanded the Catholic Emperor to proceed without fear to the rescue of his Catholic brethren. Africa, subdued by the arms of Belisarius, returned at once under the dominion of the empire and of Catholicism. The Vandal Arianism had made no proselytes among the hereditary disciples of Cyprian and Augustine, the hearers of Fulgentius and of Augustine's scholars. Persecution had its usual effect when it stops short of extermination, it had only strengthened the inflexible orthodoxy of the province. One imperial edict was sufficient to restore all the churches to the Catholic worship. Donatism, which still survived, though included under the same condemnation, was endowed with more obstinate vitality, and was hardly extinguished before the final disruption

Conquest of Africa.

A.D. 533.

the authority of Sir John Macneill, 'that he knew several persons who had been subjected to that punishment, who spoke so intelligibly as to be able to transact business. More than one of them, finding that my curiosity and interest was excited, showed me the stump.' Sir John Macneill's description of the mode of operation fully coincides with the following opinion of the most distinguished surgical authority in England:—'There seems to me nothing mysterious in the histories of the excision of the tongue. The modification of the voice forming articulate speech is effected especially by the motions of the soft palate, the tongue, and the lips, and partly by means of the teeth and cheeks. The mutilation of any one of these organs will affect the speech as far as that organ is concerned and no farther, the effect being to render the speech more or less imperfect, but not to destroy it altogether. The excision of the whole tongue is an impossible operation.' What Colonel Churchill attributed to the growth of the tongue is explained in another manner.—See 'Notes and Queries,' March, 1858.

of Africa from the great Christian system by Mohammedanism.

The Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric, in the mean time, was declining through internal dissension; the inevitable consequence of female sway, and that of a king too early raised to the throne, too soon emancipated from his mother's control by the mistaken fondness of the Goths, who, while they desired to educate him as a warlike Amala among his noble peers, abandoned him to the unchecked corruption of Roman manners. Rome conquered Athalaric by her vices. Premature debauchery wasted the bodily frame, and paralysed the intellect of the young Gothic king. Even the all-accomplished Amalasuntha, who spoke the languages of all her subjects with the most exquisite perfection, and, in some degree, blended the virtues of both races, yet wanted somewhat of the commanding strength of character which hallowed the noble Teutonic female. In an evil hour, while her son was sinking towards the grave, she bestowed her hand and the kingdom on her cousin, the unworthy Theodotus. Theodotus, master of the crown, imprisoned Amalasuntha, and soon put her to death. He then dragged out a few years of inglorious sovereignty, till the indignant Goths wrested away the sceptre to place it in the hands of the valiant Witiges.

Justinian watched the affairs of Italy without betraying his ambitious designs; but all who were dissatisfied with the state of affairs, turned their eyes to the East. Amalasuntha at one time had determined to abandon the kingdom, to place herself under the protection of Justinian: the fleet was ready to sail to Dyrrachium. Constant amicable intercourse was still

taking place between the Catholic clergy of the East and West, between Constantinople and Rome, between Justinian and the rapid succession of Pontiffs, who occupied the throne during the ten years between the death of Theodoric and the invasion of Italy.

Felix IV. had just been acknowledged as Pope when Theodoric died; his peaceful pontificate lasted four years. The contests for the Papacy were not prevented by the agreement under Theodoric. A double election took place on the death of Felix. The partisans of either faction were prepared for a fierce struggle, when the timely death of his rival Dioscorus left Boniface II. in undisputed possession of the throne. Yet so exasperated were the parties, that Boniface would not allow his competitor to sleep in his grave; he fulminated an anathema against him as an anti-Pope, and compelled the clergy to sign the decree. It was revoked during the next pontificate. Boniface was of Gothic blood,^d perhaps promoted by the Gothic party. He attempted a bold measure in order to get rid of the disgraceful and disastrous scenes of violence and bribery, which now seemed inveterate in the Papal elections.

He proposed that during his lifetime the Pope should nominate his successor: he proceeded to designate Vigilius, a deacon, who afterwards ascended the Papal throne. An obsequious Council ratified this extraordinary proceeding. Both parties, however, equally resented this attempt to wrest from them their undoubted privilege, and thus to reduce the Papacy to an ordinary inheritance at the disposition of

Pope Felix
IV.
A.D. 526-530
October 14,
Boniface II.
A.D. 530.

A.D. 531.

A.D. 532.

^d He was the son of Count Sigisbult or Sigisvult, though called a Roman by Anastasius.—Anastas. in Vit.

its possessor. In a second Council they showed their repugnance and astonishment at the daring innovation. The Pope acknowledged his own decree to be an act of treason against ecclesiastical and even civil law, burned it in public, and left the election of his successor to proceed in the old course.^e There were again at the death of Boniface fierce strife, undisguised bribery, and shame and horror after all was over. Remedies were

sought for this ineradicable disease. On the
Dec. 31, 532

death of Boniface, the Roman Senate resumed some of its ancient authority, and issued an edict prohibiting these base and venal proceedings, during which the funds designed for the poor were loaded with debts, even the sacred vessels sold for these simoniacal uses. Athalaric confirmed this edict.^f John II., whose former name was Mercurius, ruled for three years. During his papacy arrived a splendid embassy from the East, with magnificent offerings, golden vessels, chalices of silver, jewels, and curtains of cloth of gold for the Church of St. Peter. The pretext was a deferential consultation

A.D. 534.

with the Pope, concerning the *Sleepless* monks, who were still not without some Nestorian tendencies. At the same time came an ambassador to Theodotus, now Ostrogothic King, with expostulations, or rather imperious menaces, on alleged violations of the treaties between the Gothic kingdom and the Empire. During the short and troubled reign of Theodotus,

^e Anastas. in Vit., and Labbe, p. 1690.

^f "Ita facultates pauperum extortis promissionibus ingravasse, ut (quod dictu nefas est) etiam sacra vasa emptioni publicæ viderentur exposita." —Athalar. Reg. Epist. apud Labbe, p. 1748. This law annulled all bar-

gains made for the appointment to bishoprics. It declared the offence to be sacrilege; and limited the payments to the chancery on contested elections, —for the papacy to 3000 golden solidi, for archbishoprics or bishoprics to 2000. 'The largess to the poor was restricted to 500.

Justinian received petitions from all parts of Italy, and from all persons, lay as well as clerical, with the air and tone of its Sovereign.

The aged Agapetus had succeeded to the Roman See before Justinian prepared for the actual invasion of Italy. In the agony of his fear Agapetus. June 2, 535. Theodotus the Goth had recourse to the same measure which Theodoric had adopted in his pride. He persuaded or compelled the Pope to proceed on an embassy to Constantinople, to ward off the impending danger, to use his influence and authority lest a Roman and orthodox Emperor should persist in his attempt to wrest Italy and Rome from a barbarous Arian; and Theodotus commanded the Prelate to be the bearer of menaces more befitting the herald of war. He was to declare the determination of the Goth, if Justinian should fulfil his hostile designs, to put the Senate to the sword, and raze the city of the Cæsars to the ground.⁸ Like his predecessor, Agapetus was received with the highest honours. Justinian had already suspended, for a short time, his warlike preparations; but Agapetus found affairs more within his province, which Agapetus in Constantinople. enabled him to display to the despot of the East the bold and independent tone assumed even against the throne by the ecclesiastics of the West. The See of Constantinople was vacant. The all-powerful Theodora summoned Anthimus, bishop of Trebisonde, to the Metropolitan diocese. Anthimus was suspected as tainted with Eutychian opinions. Agapetus resolutely declined to communicate with a Prelate, whose appointment not merely violated the Canon against translation from one see to another, but one likewise of doubtful

⁸ The embassy was in Constantinople, Feb. 2, 536.

orthodoxy. The venal partisans of Anthimus and of Theodora insinuated counter-charges of Nestorian inclinations against the Bishop of Rome.^b Agapetus, in a conference, condescended to satisfy the Emperor as to his own unimpeachable orthodoxy. Justinian sternly commanded him to communicate with Anthimus. "With the Bishop of Trebisonde," replied the unawed ecclesiastic, "when he has returned to his diocese, and accepted the Council of Chalcedon and the letters of Leo." The Emperor in a louder voice commanded him to acknowledge the Bishop of Constantinople on pain of immediate exile. "I came hither in my old age to see, as I supposed, a religious and a Christian Emperor, I find a new Diocletian. But I fear not Kings' menaces, I am ready to lay down my life for the truth." The feeble mind of Justinian passed at once from the height of arrogance to admiration and respect; he listened to the charges advanced by Agapetus against the orthodoxy of Anthimus. In his turn the Bishop of Constantinople was summoned to render an account of his theology before the Emperor, convicted of Eutychianism, and degraded from the see. Mennas, nominated in his room, was consecrated by the Pope. Thus one Patriarch of Constantinople was degraded, another April 22, 536. promoted by the influence, if not by the authority (the distinction was not marked, as in later theological disputes) of the Bishop of Rome. Agapetus did not live long to enjoy his triumph; he died at Constantinople; his funeral rites were celebrated with great magnificence; his body sent to Rome. His memory was venerated alike in the East and in the West.

But the next few years beheld the Papacy degraded

^b Libellus de Reb. Gestis ab Agap. æ Constant. apud Baronium. 536.

from its lofty and independent dignity. Rome was now within the dominions of the sole Emperor of the world. Belisarius, in his unchecked career of conquest, had subdued Africa, Sicily, Naples; he entered undefended Rome as its master.¹ The Pope became first the victim, then the base instrument of the temporal power. Rome, now a city of the Eastern Empire, was brought at once within the sphere of the female intrigues of Constantinople; one Pope, Silverius, suffered degradation; another, the most doubtful character who had yet sat on the throne of St. Peter, received his appointment through the arts of the infamous Theodora, and suffered the judicial punishment of his weaknesses and crimes, — persecution, shame, remorse. Silverius, the new Pope, was the son of the former Pontiff Hormisdas, the legitimate son, born before the father had taken holy orders. Silverius was Bishop of Rome by command of Theodotus, yet undegraded from the Ostrogothic throne.^k But the Romans saw with undisguised but miscalculating pride, the Roman banners, floating over the army of Belisarius, approach their walls. The Pope dared (the Goths were in confusion at the degradation of Theodotus, and the elevation of Witiges) to urge the Romans to send an ambassador to hail the deliverer of the city from the barbaric Goth.¹ The Bishop of Rome received the General of the East, and, as it were, restored Rome to the Roman empire. Belisarius was lord of the Capitol, and at once the consequence of Rome's subjugation to the East broke upon the Pope and upon Rome. Theo-

Justinian
conquers
Italy and
Rome.

Rome sur-
rendered to
Belisarius.

¹ See the war in Gibbon, ch. xl.

^k Sine deliberatione decreti, Vi.
Sylv. Confer. Marcell Chion. Jaffe.
Eusebia sub ann. 536. He was con-

secrated June 8.

¹ μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς Σιλβέριος εἰς
τοῦτο ἐνήγγεν, ὃ τῇσδε τῆς πόλεως
ἀρχιερεὺς. Procop. de B. G. . 5, 14.

dora had never abandoned her hopes of promoting her favourite, Anthimus, to the See of Constantinople; she entered into a league with the Deacon Vigilius, who had accompanied the Pope Agapetus into the East.

Vigilius. Vigilius was a man of unmeasured ambition,

and great ability; he had been designated as his successor by Pope Boniface; and when the unanimous voice of the clergy and the people wrested from Boniface the usurped right of nominating his successor, Vigilius was left to brood over other means of attaining the pontificate. The compact proposed by the Empress, and accepted by the unscrupulous Vigilius, stipulated on her part the degradation of Silverius, and a large sum of money,^m no doubt, to secure his election, and to consolidate his interest in Rome; on that of the ecclesiastic, no less than the condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and the acknowledgment of Anthimus as Bishop of Constantinople. The degradation of Silverius was intrusted not to the all powerful Belisarius alone, but to the surer hands of his wife Antonina, the accomplice of the Empress in all her intrigues of every kind, and her counterpart in the arbitrary power with which she ruled her glorious but easy husband. The Pope Silverius was accused of treasonable correspondence with the Goths, witnesses were suborned to support this improbable charge against him who had yielded up the city to the conqueror. Belisarius, it is said, endeavoured to save the Pope from degradation, by inducing him to accede to the wishes of Theodora, to condemn the Council of Chalcedon, and to communicate with Anthimus. The resolution of Silverius, who firmly

February.
March, 537

^m "Lubenter ergo suscepit Vigilius permissum ejus, amore episcopatus et auri."—*Liberat. Breviar. c. xxii.*

rejected these propositions, left him the defenceless victim of Vigilius and of Antonina. The successor of St. Peter was rudely summoned to the Pincian Palace, the military quarters of Belisarius. In the chamber of the General sat Antonina on the bed, with her husband at her feet. "What have we done," exclaimed the imperious woman, "to you, Pope Silverius, and to the Romans, that you should betray us to the Goths?" In an instant the pall was rent from his shoulders by a sub-deacon, he was hurried into another room, stripped of the rest of his dress, and clad in that of a monk. The clergy who accompanied him were informed of his degradation in a few careless words; "The Pope Silverius is deposed, and is now a monk." The most extraordinary part of this strange transaction is the utter ignorance of Justinian of the whole intrigue. From Patara, the place of his banishment, Silverius made his way to Constantinople, and to the amazement of the Emperor preferred his complaint of the unjust violence with which he had been expelled from his See. Justinian commanded his instant return to Rome. If, on further investigation, it should appear that he had been unjustly accused of treason, he was to be reinstated in his dignity. The sudden reappearance of Silverius in Rome (he had outsailed the messengers of Theodora) embarrassed for a time, only for a short time, the unscrupulous Vigilius, and his more than imperial patrons. By the influence of Antonina, Silverius was delivered up to his rival, and banished by him who aspired to be the head of Christendom, to the island of Pandataria, infamous as the place of exile to which the worst heathen emperors had consigned the victims of their tyranny. On this wretched rock Silverius soon closed his life, whether in the course of nature or by violent means, seems to

have been known with no more certainty in his own days than in ours.ⁿ

Vigilius was now, by command of Belisarius,^o the undisputed Pontiff of Rome.^p He had paid already a fearful price for his advancement,—false accusation, cruel oppression, perhaps murder. At Rome he declares his adhesion to the four councils and to the letter of Leo; he approves the anathema of Mennas of Constantinople against the Monophysites.^q But four years after, Theodora demanded, and Vigilius dared not refuse, the rest of his unholy covenant, at least the base and secret adoption of all her heretical opinions. In a letter still extant,^r but contested on account of its damning effect on one who was, or who afterwards became Pope, rather than from any mark, either external or internal, of spuriousness, Vigilius gave his deliberate adhesion to Eutychianism. The busy and

ⁿ Anastasi vita. Liberatus writes briefly and significantly, “Solus ingressus a suis ulterius non est visus.” —Breviar. c. xxiii.

^o ἕτερον δὲ ἀρχιερέα, ὀλίγη ὄστερον Βιγίλιον ὄνομα κατεστήσατο. So writes the Greek Procopius of Belisarius

^p The date of his accession is a point of grave dispute. If it is reckoned from his first nomination to the see, he can only be held an uncanonical usurper of an unvacated see, and that nomination must have been null and void. A second election therefore has been supposed; but of this event there is no accredited record. It is impossible to connect the broken links of the spiritual genealogy.

^q A. D. 540, September 17.—Mansi. ix. 35, 38.

^r The letter is given by Liberatus. One main argument against its authenticity is, that he was never charged with it by his enemies or by Justinian. But it was a private letter to Theodora, and contains this sentence: “Oportet ergo, ut hæc quæ vobis scribo, nullus agnoscat.” The letter may not have come to light till after the death of Theodora. But, with some mistrust of their own feeble critical arguments, the high papal writers assert that Vigilius, when he wrote this letter, was only an antipope and a schismatic. His subsequent legitimate election arrayed him in perfect Christian faith and virtue. He became officially orthodox. Binn not. in Liberatum. Dupin ventures to say that Liberatus is better authority than either Baronius or Binus.

restless theology of the East had now raised a new question, and Justinian aspired to the dignity of a profound divine, and a legislator of Christian doctrine as well as of Christian civil affairs. He plunged with headstrong zeal into the controversy.* The Church was not now disturbed by the sublime, if inexplicable, dogmas concerning the nature of God, the Persons of the Trinity, or the union of the divine and human nature of Christ; concerning the revelations of Scripture, or even the opinions of the ancient fathers. The orthodoxy or heterodoxy of certain writings by bishops, but recently dead, became the subject of Imperial edicts, of a fifth so called Œcumenic Council, held at Constantinople, and a religious war between the East and the West. Under the name of the three Chapters, the Emperor and the obsequious Council condemned certain works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa.† These writings, though questionable as the source of, or as infected with Nestorianism, had passed uncondemned by the Council of Chalcedon. The Imperial edict usurped the form of a

* Justinian had already made an essay of his theological powers. In Palestine the controversy concerning the opinions of Origen had broken out again, and caused violent popular tumults. Pelagius, the legate of the Pope, and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Mennas, urged the interference of Justinian. The emperor threw himself headlong into the dispute, and issued an encyclic letter, condemning the Origenists; the imperial anathema was subscribed by Mennas and many other bishops at Constantinople.

† The condemnation of the three chapters implied at least a covert cen-

sure of the Council of Chalcedon. I. The fathers of that council had received Theodoret into communion, and, content with his condemnation of Nestorius, had not demanded his retraction of his writings against Cyril of Alexandria. II. They had inserted in their proceedings a letter from Ibas of Edessa to the Patriarch of Mays in which he highly praised Theodorus of Mopsuestia, the master of Nestorius, blamed Cyril, and accused the Council of Ephesus as having too hastily condemned Nestorius.—Anastas. in Vita.

confession of faith, and trespassed on the exclusive right of the clergy to anathematise the holders of erroneous doctrines. Great part of the submissive or consentient East received the dictates of the Imperial theologian; the West as generally and resolutely refused compliance. Vigilius was peremptorily summoned to Constantinople.

A.D. 544. He set forth, loaded with the imprecations of the Roman people, and assailed with volleys of stones, as the murderer of Silverius, and a man of notorious cruelty. It was said that he had killed one of his own secretaries in a fit of passion, and caused his nephew, the son of his sister, to be scourged to death. "May famine and pestilence pursue thee; evil hast thou done to us, may evil overtake thee wherever thou art." A strong guard protected his person first to Sicily, and thence after nearly two years' delay to Constantinople.

His departure from Rome was fortunate for himself, fortunate perhaps for the dignity of the Papacy. During his absence, Rome was besieged by the Goths. A supply of corn sent by Vigilius from Sicily was intercepted on the Tiber by the barbarians; the Bishop Valentinus, who accompanied it, was summoned before the savage conqueror, and appearing to prevaricate, was mutilated by cutting off both his hands. It was fortunate on another account: Constantinople alone witnessed the weakness and tergiversations of Vigilius, who at least three times pliantly yielded to, and then desperately resisted the theologic dictatorship of Justinian; three times condemned the three Chapters, three times recanted his condemnation. Constantinople alone witnessed the personal indignities, the persecutions of which reports, perhaps exaggerated, reached the West, but which were neither rendered glorious to a servant of Christ by Christian blamelessness (the sense of which

might have allayed their bitterness) or by Christian meekness and resolution, which might have turned them to his honour and to his peace. Vigilius had the sufferings, but neither the outward dignity nor the inward consolation of martyrdom.

It was a perilous crisis for a Prelate so ambitious, yet so double-minded, so trammelled by former obligations, and so bound by common guilt to one of the contending parties. For there was division in the court; Justinian and Theodora, as throughout in religious interests, were on opposite sides; the East and the West were irreconcilably adverse. Vigilius was emboldened by his honourable reception in Constantinople; the Emperor and the Pope are said to have wept, when they first met.^a The death of Theodora soon relieved Vigilius from some part of his embarrassment. Yet he miscalculated his power, and dared to resist the Imperial will; he refused to condemn the three Chapters. He even ventured to address the Emperor under the favourite appellation, bestowed on all imperial opponents of ecclesiastical authority, as a new Diocletian. He excluded from his communion Mennas, the Patriarch of Constantinople; he excommunicated Theodorus of Cesarea, and even the departed Empress herself. Mennas threw back the anathema, and on his side excommunicated the Pope. Vigilius was ere long obliged to withdraw his censures, and to reconcile himself with the rival Prelate. Scarcely, indeed, had many months passed before the Pope at the head of a Council of seventy bishops, issued his infallible anathema *against* the three Chapters. The West at once threw off its allegiance,

A.D. 548.

June 11, 548.

A.D. 548.

^a Anastas. in Vit.

and refused to listen to the ingenious sophistry with which Vigilius attempted to reconcile his solemn judgment with his former opinions. Illyricum, Africa with all her old dauntless pertinacity, even his own clergy revolted against the renegade Pope. He revoked his imprudent concessions, recanted his recantation, and prevailed on the Emperor to summon a Council, in order, it should seem, either to obtain the support of the Council against the Emperor, or to compel the Western bishops to give up their resistance. The Eastern prelates assembled in great numbers at the Council, the Western stood aloof. Vigilius refused to sanction or recognise the Council in the absence of the Western bishops. Justinian, indignant at the delay, promulgated a new edict, condemning the three Chapters in still stronger terms on his own plenary authority. Vigilius assembled as many bishops as he could collect, solemnly protested against the usurpation of ecclesiastical authority, and cut off from his communion all who received the edict. But a Byzantine despot was not to be thus trifled with or boldly bearded in his own capital, and the Eastern bishops refused to hold communion with the successor of St. Peter. Apprehensive of violence, the Pope took refuge in a sanctuary; but neither the Emperor nor his troops were disposed to reverence the sacred right of asylum. They attempted to drag him forth by the feet, he clung to the altar, and being a large and powerful man, the pillars of the baldachin gave way, and the whole fell crumbling upon him.* The populace could not belie^{ve}

* Vigilius himself relates the former outrage, but does not mention particularly the other indignities; but he says, "*Dum multa mala intolerabili* sapius pateremur quæ jam omnibus vota esse confidimus."—*Epist. Encycl.* apud Labbe, p. 330.

without compassion these personal outrages, heaped on a venerable ecclesiastic; the imperial officers were obliged to retire and leave Vigilius within the church. He was persuaded, however, on certain terms to leave his sanctuary. Again he suffered, according to rumours propagated in the West, still more barbarous usage; he was said to have been dragged through the city with a rope round his neck, and reproached with his crimes and cruelties, then committed to a common dungeon, and kept on the hardest prison diet, bread and water. A second time he escaped to his sanctuary, and from thence by night fled over the sea to Chalcedon. There he took refuge in the more awful and inviolable sanctuary of Saint Euphemia. The Emperor condescended to capitulate on honourable terms with the Prelate. He revoked his edict, and left the three Chapters to the decrees of the Council. Vigilius had promised to be present at the Council; but dared not confront alone the host of Eastern bishops who composed it. The Council, according to the dominant sentiment of the East, renewed the condemnation of the three Chapters. Vigilius with difficulty collected sixteen Western bishops, issued a protest against the decree, and a Constitution, solemnly acquitting the three Chapters of heresy. The wrath of the Emperor was again kindled; Vigilius was once more seized and sent in exile to the dreary and solitary rock of Proconnesus. There his courage or his patience failed. Alarming reports reached him, that his name was to be struck out of the diptychs; that

A.D. 557.

A.D. 553.

[†] Theodorus of Cæsarea was the ecclesiastic who ruled the mind of Justinian. See the imperfect anathema and sentence of deposition against him —Labbe.

orders were preparing for Rome to elect a new bishop. He intimated that now, at length, on more studious examination, he had detected the subtle and latent errors which had so long escaped his impeccable judgement, and was prepared with a Constitution, condemnatory of those baneful writings. He was recalled to Constantinople, obtained leave, after his full submission, to return to Rome, but died in Sicily of the stone, before he could reach his see.

A.D. 554.

June 7, 554.

Such was the miserable fate of a Pope who came into direct collision with the Imperial despotism of Constantinople. A Prelate of unimpeachable character, uncommitted by base subserviency to the court, and who had not owed his elevation to unworthy means, or one of more firm religious courage, might have escaped some portion of the degradation and contempt endured by Vigilius; but it is impossible not to observe again how much the Papal power owed to the position of Rome. Even its freedom, far more its authority, arose out of its having ceased to be the seat of Imperial government, and the residence of the Emperor. During the conquest of Italy by the Eastern Emperors, and for some time after, the Pope was not confronted indeed in Rome by a resident Emperor, but summoned at the will of the Emperor to Constantinople, or in Rome rebuked before a victorious general, or an Exarch, who, though he held his court at Ravenna, executed the commands of a sovereign accustomed to dictate, rather than submit to ecclesiastical power. At scarcely any period did the papal authority suffer greater degradation, or were the persons of the Popes reduced to more humiliating subserviency. Nor is this passive humiliation, which by the patient dignity with which it is endured

may elevate the character of the sufferer; he is mingled up in the intrigues of the court, and contaminated with its base venality. He is hardly more independent or authoritative than the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The successor of Vigilius was Pelagius I. Pelagius had been the legate or ambassador of Vigilius at the court of Constantinople. He had won the favour of Justinian, and accumulated considerable wealth. He returned to Rome, a short time before it was besieged by Totila; and the wealth, obtained it might seem by doubtful means in the East, was nobly dispensed among the poor and famishing inhabitants of the beleaguered city. Pelagius during the Popedom of Vigilius had been employed on the most important services. When the Goths again contested the dominion of Italy, he had undertaken an embassy in the name of the Romans to avert the wrath of Totila; he had been received with stately courtesy, but dismissed with no concession on the part of the Goth.* After the capture of the city, when the victorious Totila entered the church of St. Peter to perform his devotions, he was met again by Pelagius, with the Gospel in his hands. "Have mercy on thy subjects," implored the earnest priest. "Now," tauntingly replied Totila, "you condescend to appear as a suppliant." "God," answered Pelagius, "has made us your subjects, be merciful to us on that account." His calm and submissive demeanour arrested the wrath of the conqueror. Rome owed to his intercession the lives of her citizens, and the chastity of her females. Massacre and violation were arrested; the discipline of the Goths respected the command of their king. Pelagius was sent by Totila as

* Procop. de Bell. Gothic., iii. 16.

his ambassador to Constantinople to demand peace, under the menace, that the Goth, if Justinian persisted in his hostility, would destroy Rome, and put the Senate to the sword.^a Pelagius again in Constantinople, adhered as a faithful partisan to Vigilius, with him he resisted the theologic tyranny of Justinian; and, if he did not share his hard usage and exile, was left to neglect and misery. With Vigilius, having shown himself too pliant to the imperial doctrines, he returned to Rome, and on the death of Vigilius, by the command of Justinian, was elevated to the See.^b But now in Rome, all his former benefactions to the city were forgotten in his treacherous abandonment of the orthodoxy of the West, and his servile compliance with the will of the Emperor; he could not assemble from all the reluctant order three bishops for the ceremonial of his consecration; it was performed by two bishops and a presbyter.^c His favour, with Justinian exposed him to worse, doubtless to unjust suspicions. He was accused of having been the instigator in Constantinople of all the cruelties suffered by Vigilius. The monks, many of the clergy, and of the nobility of Rome, withdrew from his communion. Even when Narses reconquered Rome, the avowed protection of the Emperor's victorious representative could not restore the public confidence to Pelagius. The Pope, with the general by his side, went in solemn procession, chanting a Litany, to the church of St. Peter; and there Pelagius ascended the chancel, and holding above his head the Book of the Gospels, and the Cross, solemnly declared that he had never wrought or sug-

^a Procop. de Bell. Gothic., iii. 20. condemned the three Chapters (ap

^b According to Victor Turon, he at Roncagl. ii. 377).
first defended, then, recalled from exile, ^c Victor Turon., apud Roncagl

gested any evil against Vigilius. Pelagius added, and to this he demanded the assent of the people, a strong denunciation of all, who, from the doorkeeper up to the bishop, should attempt to obtain any ecclesiastical office by simony.^d

Rome, after this expurgation, acquiesced in the rule of her Pontiff. But the Western bishops could not forgive his adhesion to the fifth Council of Constantinople, whose decrees had in some degree impeached those of the great Council of Chalcedon. Even in Italy the bishops of Tuscany would not admit his name into their sacramental liturgy. Pelagius bitterly reproached them with thus yielding to vulgar clamour; by separating themselves from the communion of the Apostolic See they had separated themselves from the communion of all Christendom. That he thought it necessary to declare his unreserved acceptance of all the four great Councils (maintaining a prudent silence as to the fifth), and the Letter of his predecessor Leo. Whoever should not be content with this declaration, might demand further explanation from the Pope himself. Yet he condemned all that his predecessors had condemned, venerated as orthodox all that they received, especially the saintly prelates, Theodoret and Ibas.^e The Pope addressed a letter to the whole Christian world, in which, after re-asserting his allegiance to the four Councils, he attempted to justify the fifth as in no way impeaching the authority of Chalcedon. A new royal theologian, Childebert, king of the Franks, entered the field, and required a more explicit statement. With this the Pope condescended to comply; he sent his confession of faith to the King, with an admonition to

^d Marcell. Chronic. apud Roncagli.

^e Mansi. ix. 17.

the orthodox sovereign to exercise vigilance over all heretics within his dominions. Still some obstinate dioceses, chiefly of Venetia and Istria, refused communion with all who adhered to the Synod of Constantinople. Pelagius had recourse to the all-powerful Narses to enforce submission; the most refractory, the Bishop of Aquileia and the Bishop of Milan, who had uncanonically consecrated that prelate, were sent prisoners to Constantinople.

On the death of Pelagius,^f Rome waited in obsequious submission the permission of the Emperor to
July 14, 560. inaugurate her new Pope, John III. The period between the accession of John III. and that of Gregory the Great is among the most barren and obscure in the annals of the papacy. One act of misjudging authority, and one of intercession, are recorded during the pontificate of John. He received, according to the permission of the Frankish King, Gunthram, the appeal of two bishops, Salonius of Embrun and Sagittarius of Gap,^g who had been deposed for crimes most unbefitting their order by a synod at Lyons. These were the first Christian bishops who had appeared in arms the prototypes of the warlike and robber-prelates of later times. The Pope urged their restoration, the King assented: but the reinstated prelates returned to their lawless and unepiscopal courses, and were again degraded by the common indignation.

The act of intercession was more worthy of the head of Western Christendom. The Eunuch Narses
A.D. 552-567. had ruled Italy and Rome as Exarch for fifteen years since the conquest, with vigour and justice Justinian and Theodora had gone to their account; the

^f Pelagius died 560.

^g "brodunum. Vapincum.

throne of the East was occupied by Justin the younger. But the province groaned under the rapacity of Narses. Petitions were sent to Constantinople with the significant words, that the yoke of the barbarian Gauls was lighter than this Roman tyranny. Narses was superseded by the Exarch Longinus, insult was added to his degradation. "Let him to his distaff," is the speech ascribed to the imperious wife of the Emperor Justin the younger. "I will weave her such a web as she will find it hard to unravel," rejoined the indignant Eunuch. He returned to Naples, from whence he entered into negotiations with the terrible Lombards, who had once already invaded Italy. Revolt, with Narses at its head, threatened the peace of Italy. The Pope undertook an embassy to Naples, appeased the wrathful Eunuch, who returned to Rome, and closed his days as a peaceful subject of the empire.

The few years of the pontificate of Benedict I. were occupied with the miseries of the Lombard invasion. His successor Pelagius II. in those disastrous times was consecrated without awaiting the sanction of the Emperor.^b Pelagius in vain endeavoured to induce the bishops of the north of Italy to accept the fifth Council of Constantinople. Some who were now under the Lombard dominion paid no regard to his expostulations; a synod at Grado rejected his mandates, and the bishops defied the power of the Exarch through whom Pelagius sought to awe them to submission. Yet Pelagius, in one respect, maintained all the haughtiness of his See. The Bishop of Constantinople had again assumed the title of Œcumenic Patriarch, the assumption was

Benedict I.
June 3, 574.
Pelagius. 578.

Nov. 27, 588

A.D. 588.

* Sine jussione Principis, Vit. Pelag. II.

confirmed by a Council at Constantinople. Pelagius
A.D. 590. protested against this execrable, sacrilegious,
 diabolic usurpation : but in Constantinople his
 invectives made no impression. Pelagius was succeeded
 by Gregory the Great.

Since the conquest of Italy the Popes had been the
 humble subjects of the Eastern Emperor. They were
 appointed, if not directly by his mandate, under his
 influence. They dared not assume their throne without
 his permission. The Roman Ordinal of that time
 declares the election incomplete and invalid till it had
 received the imperial sanction.¹ Months elapsed, in the
 case of Benedict ten months, before the clergy ventured
 to proceed to the consecration.

Pelagius II. was chosen when Rome was invested by
 the Lombards ; for this ignominious reason he had been
 consecrated without the consent of the Emperor.

The conquest of Italy by the Greeks was, to a great
 extent at least, the work of the Catholic clergy. Their
 impatience under a foreign and an Arian yoke is by no
 means surprising ; nor could they anticipate that the
 return to Roman dominion would be the worst evil yet
 endured by Italy. Rome suffered more under the
 alternate sieges and alternate capture by the Byzantines
 and the Goths than it had from Alaric or even Genseric,
 as much perhaps as in its later sieges by Robert
 Guiscard, and by the Constable Bourbon. The feeble
 but tyrannical Exarchs soon made Italy regret the just,
 if oppressive and ungenial rule of the Goths. The
 overthrow of the Gothic kingdom was to Italy an un-
 mitigated evil. A monarch like Witiges or Totila
 would soon have repaired the mischiefs caused by the

¹ Compare Schroeck, xvii. p. 236.

degenerate successors of Theodoric, Athalaric and Theodatus. In their overthrow began the fatal policy of the Roman See, fatal at least to Italy (however, by the aggrandisement of the Roman See, it may have been, up to a certain time, beneficial to northern Christendom), which never would permit a powerful native kingdom to unite Italy, or a very large part of it, under one dominion. Whatever it may have been to Christendom, the Papacy has been the eternal, implacable foe of Italian independence and Italian unity; and so (as far as independence and unity might have given dignity, political weight, and prosperity) to the welfare of Italy. On every occasion the Goths, the Lombards, as later the Normans and the House of Arragon, found their deadliest enemies in the Popes. As now from the East, so then from beyond the Alps, they summoned some more remote potentate, Charlemagne, the Othos, Charles VIII., Charles of Anjou, almost always worse tyrants than those whom they overthrew. From that time servitude, servitude to the stranger, was the doom of Italy. To Rome herself, the foreign sovereign (the tyranny of the Eastern Emperor and his Exarchs was an admonition of what the transalpine emperors might hereafter prove) was hardly less dangerous than a native and indigenous sovereign would have been. And if the papacy had been more confined to its religious power, less tempted or less compelled to assume temporal as well as ecclesiastical supremacy, that power had been immeasurably greater, as less involved in political strife, less exposed to that kind of personal collision with the temporal monarchy, in which a sovereignty which rests on the awe and reverence of men must suffer; it might have maintained its ecclesiastical supremacy over obedient and tributary Christendom, even held as vast

possessions on the tenure not of a temporal principedom, but of an ecclesiastical endowment; and thus more entirely ruled the minds of men by confining its authority to that nobler and, for a time at least, more unassailable province.

Rome, jealous of all temporal sovereignty but her own, for centuries yielded up, or rather made Italy a battle-field to the Transalpine and the stranger; and at the same time so secularised her own spiritual supremacy as to confound altogether the priest and the politician, to degrade absolutely and almost irrevocably the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world. '.

END OF VOL. I.

